The Catholic Historical Review

NEW SERIES, VOLUME VII **APRIL, 1927** NUMBER 1

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER 27-28, 1926

Under the auspices of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, the seventh annual meeting of the Association was held in that city on Monday and Tuesday, December 27-28, 1926. Over one hundred members were registered for the sessions which took place at the Hotel Bellevue-Stratford. The programme arranged for the meeting included originally eight papers. By the death of the Very Reverend Monsignor J. L. J. Kirlin, who was to read a paper on the *Politico-Religious Background of the Quebec Act*, and through the unavoidable absence of Dr. James J. Walsh, only six papers were read.

The first of these, entitled *William Penn and the Catholic Church*, by Mr. St. Alban Kite, a recent convert from the Quaker faith, was of special value owing to the interest in Penn awakened by the Sesquicentennial Exposition. The line dividing Penn's anti-Catholic activities from his more liberal attitude towards the Church was described by the speaker as something so abrupt that it is difficult to explain the change unless one accepts the explanation that the great founder was a true son of a time-serving age. The number of small works against Catholicism by William Penn is much larger than is generally known; but, as the speaker analyzed these, it became evident that Penn gradually realized the errors underlying his tracts and, once his colony was founded, determined to open Pennsylvania to the persecuted Catholics. Mr. James Breen's essay on *Catholic Participation in the War of Independence* was a well-measured and accurate description of the historic unity of Catholic thought and action

with the ideals of the founders of the Republic. Many legends and misstatements have grown up regarding Catholic participation in the critical events of the American Revolution. The speaker traced these to their sources with the result that the actual events assumed a proper and an enviable prominence in the history of those stirring times. Rightly stressed were two outstanding events: the first official celebration of the Declaration of Independence, on July 4, 1779, in St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, when the President and the members of the Continental Congress were present and a sermon was preached by Abbé Bandol, chaplain to the French Minister; and a similar celebration after the victory of Yorktown, when Congress was present at a Te Deum service and again listened to Father Bandol.

The luncheon conference on Monday was devoted to a consideration of a *Guide to the Printed Materials for American Catholic History,* which Dr. Guilday has had in preparation for the past two years. A lengthy report was made on the scope and progress of this much-needed volume, and on motion of Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, seconded by the Rev. Felix Fellner, O.S.B., it was voted to subsidize the compilation and the printing of the work from the funds of the Association. Dr. Guilday's plan for the volume included three parts: 1. an introduction treating the question of the location and availibility of unprinted material for American Catholic history; 2. a general bibliography of 5,000 carefully selected works, to be listed alphabetically, but without any critical analysis; 3. a special bibliography, based upon these 5,000 as essential works, with a critical evaluation of these and of all secondary printed works on or about the subjects treated. This special bibliography will be divided into three parts: 1. *repertories* (bibliographical lists, guides, dictionaries, catalogues, and encyclopedias); 2. *didactic works*: a. general works on American Catholic history; b. special works:—provincial, diocesan, and parochial histories; histories of missions, of religious orders and congregations; ecclesiastical biographies; works on charitable and social welfare institutions; Catholic education; Church and State; religious toleration; conciliar and synodal legislation; conversions; controversies, and other topical questions of American Catholic life and action;

3. *periodicals*, namely, historical reviews and publications, and newspapers. Under this last heading, an effort will be made to give a complete list of the Catholic press, with indications where the rarer copies of these newspapers may be found. Finally, an index covering every aspect of the book is to be added, with the view of rendering as perfect a service to the student as possible. The Right Rev. Philip R. McDevitt, D.D., Bishop of Harrisburg, Father Frederic Siedenberg, S.J., of Chicago, the Very Rev. Felix Fellner, O.S.B., of Beatty, Penna., Father Gilbert G. Garraghan, S.J., of St. Louis, and others present, took part in the discussion which followed.

The session on Monday afternoon consisted of two papers: *Conversions to the Catholic Church in the United States* by the Hon. William Franklin Sands, of Washington, D. C., and *Mathew Carey*, by Mr. Edward J. Galbally, of Philadelphia, the managing editor of the *Ecclesiastical Review*. Both papers elicited much favorable comment. Mr. Sands' essay was one of the most remarkable and most outspoken ever listened to by the members of the Association. No biography of Mathew Carey by a Catholic has as yet appeared. Mr. Galbally found so much published and unpublished material on this prominent Catholic layman of the last years of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth centuries, that his paper was of necessity limited to the more salient points of Carey's life. Both papers will be eagerly awaited by the readers of this REVIEW in which they will appear during the present year.

The reception tendered to the Association by the American Catholic Historical Society at its spacious headquarters, the old Nicholas Biddle mansion at 715 Spruce Street, was the only social event of this seventh annual meeting. Under the efficient direction of the Reception Committee, of which Miss Ada Dallett was chairman, the large reception room of the house was tastefully decorated for the occasion, at which over one hundred guests were present.

Before the reception, the final meeting of the Executive Council was held in the library of the Society. Dr. Lawrence F. Flick presided in the absence of Dr. Moon, the President. Summary reports were given from the Committee on Local Arrangements, of which Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue was chairman, from

the programme committee, from the committee on membership, and from the treasurer. The committee on nominations presented the following names for 1927:

President: Clarence E. Martin, Esq., Martinsburg, W. Va.
First Vice-President: Richard M. Reilly, K.S.G., Lancaster, Pa.
Second Vice-President: John C. Fitzpatrick, Library of Congress.
Treasurer: Right Reverend Monsignor C. F. Thomas, D.D., V.F., Washington, D. C.
Secretary: Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, Washington, D. C.
Assistant Secretary: Rev. Dr. Edward J. Hickey, Detroit, Mich.
Archivist: Miss Frances Louise Trew, Washington, D. C.

Executive Council:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis H. Gavisk, D.D., Indianapolis, Ind.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. E. J. Blackwell, D.D., Milwaukee, Wis.
Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. James J. Walsh, K.S.G., New York, N. Y.
Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, New York, N. Y.

The new members voted into the Association were as follows: *Life member:* Rev. Thomas J. Crotty, Lancaster, Pa.; *Annual members:* Most Rev. Arthur J. Drossaerts, D.D., LL.D., San Antonio, Texas; Most Rev. J. W. Shaw, D.D., New Orleans, La.; Rt. Rev. Jos. R. Crimont, S.J., D.D., Juneau, Alaska; Rt. Rev. Thomas W. Drumm, D.D., Des Moines, Iowa; Rt. Rev. Edmond J. FitzMaurice, D.D., Wilmington, Del.; Rt. Rev. Michael J. Gallagher, D.D., Detroit, Mich.; Rt. Rev. Wm. J. Hafey, D.D., Raleigh, N. C.; Rt. Rev. Francis M. Kelly, D.D., Winona, Minn.; Rt. Rev. Michael J. Keyes, D.D., Savannah, Ga.; Rt. Rev. Thos. F. Lillis, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.; Rt. Rev. John F. Noll, D.D., Fort Wayne, Ind.; Rt. Rev. Thos. M. O'Leary, D.D., Springfield, Mass.; Rt. Rev. J. G. Pinten, D.D., Superior, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Alphonse J. Smith, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.; Rt. Rev. Samuel A. Stritch, D.D., Toledo, Ohio; Rt. Rev. C. Van de Ven, D.D., Alexandria, La.; Rt. Rev. T. A. Welch, D.D., Duluth, Minn.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. E. J. Blackwell, D.D., Milwaukee, Wis.; Rt. Rev.

Msgr. J. A. Cunnane, D.D., Baltimore, Md.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edw. J. Egan, D.D., Phillipsburg, N. J.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. F. Foley, D.D., Baltimore, Md.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. A. Hanly, D.D., Seattle, Wash.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. F. Kivelitz, D.D., Freehold, N. J.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. Nolan, D.D., Fort Worth, Texas; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edw. F. Quirk, D.D., Newark, N. J.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. B. J. Sheil, Chicago, Ill.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stafford, D.D., Seattle, Wash.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Geo. F. Walsh, V.F., Houston, Texas; Rev. Robert J. Achstetter, S.T.L., Baltimore, Md.; Rev. James F. Barbian, M.A., Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Wm. J. Barry, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Arthur J. Breen, Dubuque, Iowa; Rev. Thomas C. Brennan, S.T.L., Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Henry Buchanan, Las Cruces, N. Mex.; Rev. M. J. Buckley, E. Bridgewater, Mass.; Rev. John J. Burke, C.S.P., Washington, D. C.; Rev. John P. Burkhiser, Lacona, Iowa; Rev. Cecil H. Chamberlain, S.J., Detroit, Mich.; Rev. John J. Cleary, New York City; Rev. John R. Command, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Rev. Leo M. Cox, Trenton, N. J.; Rev. Patrick L. Crayton, S.T.L., Monponsett, Mass.; Rev. Athanasius Dengler, O.S.B., Conception, Mo.; Rev. F. X. Dominiak, Blossburg, Penn.; Rev. M. P. Dreiling, S.T.B., St. Peter, Kans.; Rev. Henry Francis Dugan, D.C.L., St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Rev. Paul Anthony Dunn, A.M., Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. Jos. A. Ells, S.T.B., Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Francis X. Feeser, Harrisburg, Pa.; Rev. John Joseph Finn, Gloversville, N. Y.; Rev. John A. Fleming, Glastonbury, Conn.; Rev. George J. Flynn, Worcester, Mass.; Very Rev. Jas. W. Gillespie, Keokuk, Iowa; Rev. A. M. Gilloegly, S.T.L., Pleasant Mount, Pa.; Rev. John A. Glenn, Williamsburg, Iowa; Rev. Eneas B. Goodwin, Downers Grove, Ill.; Rev. John Greaney, Woodlawn, Pa.; Rev. V. F. Griffin, Dexter, Mich.; Rev. F. J. Halloran, Wakefield, Mass.; Rev. Thos. L. Harmon, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Gerald Hawkins, Silver Creek, N. Y.; Rev. Dennis A. Hayes, LL.D., Mt. Clemens, Mich.; Rev. Wm. Hayward, Upper Darby, Pa.; Rev. Charles W. Heath, J.C.D., Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Edward J. Heil, M.A., Freehold, N. J.; Rev. Paschasius Heriz, O.C.D., Washington, D. C.; Rev. Augustine F. Hickey, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. William John Hickey, S.T.D., Phillipsburg, N. J.; Rev. Henry Hoerner, M.A., Sioux Falls, S. D.; Rev. James C. Hogan, Stevens Point, Wis.; Rev. C. J. Hollie, Chappell, Nebr.; Very Rev. Raphael M. Huber, O.M.C., D.D.,

Washington, D. C.; Rev. Edward Hughes, O.P., S.T.Lr., New York, N. Y.; Rev. Reginald Hughes, O.P., S.T.Lr., River Forest, Ill.; Rev. James J. Howard, Worcester, Mass.; Rev. J. J. Hunt, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. A. M. Jeurgens, S.V.D., Techny, Ill.; Rev. Adrian J. Kilker, J.C.D., Wayne, Pa.; Rev. R. A. Kinnavey, A.B., S.T.B., Davenport, Iowa; Rev. C. J. Kirkfleet, O.Praem., Sublette, Ill.; Rev. Jos. B. Koncevicius, M.A., Brookland, D. C.; Rev. Leo J. Laige, Battle Creek, Mich.; Rev. Pierre Launay, O.S.F.S., Childs, Md.; Rev. John F. Linskey, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Leo Vincent Lyden, A.B., St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. T. S. McDermott, O.P., S.T.Lr., Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. Capt. E. J. MacDonald, M.C., Alexandria, Canada; Rev. John C. McGovern, A.M., S.T.B., Lebanon, Pa.; Very Rev. Jos. McSorley, C.S.P., New York, N. Y.; Rev. James L. McSweeny, A. M., S.T.B., Wilmington, Del.; Rev. John C. Marsh, S.T.B., Monroe, La.; Rev. M. M. Merkl, Juniata, Nebr.; Rev. Paul D. Moore, A.B., Davenport, Iowa; Rev. James P. Murray, St. Louis, Mo.; Very Rev. John T. Nicholson, V.G., Laramie, Wyo.; Rev. Patrick J. F. O'Beirne, Tyler, Kans.; Rev. Lewis J. O'Hern, C.S.P., J.C.D., Brookland, D. C.; Rev. Thos. A. O'Melia, S.T.B., Honkong, China; Rev. Thomas J. O'Rourke, M.A., Brookland, D. C.; Rev. Warren Peek, A. B., Ann Arbor, Mich.; Rev. William D. Pike, Bardstown, Ky.; Rev. Cyril Piontek, O.F.M., Green Bay, Wis.; Rev. Felix N. Pitt, Louisville, Ky.; Rev. Leo J. Post, J.C.B., Hazleton, Pa.; Rev. A. S. Quinlan, Haddon Heights, N. J.; Rev. George J. Reid, S.T.L., Clarksville, Texas; Rev. L. J. Ripple, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. A. E. Robinson, S.T.L., J.C.B., Riverton, Ill.; Rev. Aloysius H. Rohde, S.J., A.M., Prairie du Chien, Wis.; Rev. Harold W. Rosebrook, Highland Park, Mich.; Rev. John P. Ruba, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Rev. Arthur J. Sawkins, Toledo, Ohio; Rev. P. J. Schmid, East Chicago, Ind.; Rev. R. M. Schneller, Pisgah, Iowa; Very Rev. A. J. Schulte, Iowa City, Iowa; Rev. Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., D.D., Brookland, D. C.; Rev. John A. Sheridan, Lynn, Mass.; Rev. George Skelly, O. F. M., St. Bonaventure, N. Y.; Rev. Speer Strahan, A.B., New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Boniface Stratemeier, O.P., Ph.D., S.T.L., Washington, D. C.; Rev. Gustave H. Unterkoefler, Flora, Ill.; Rev. Thos. A. Walsh, Washington, D. C.; Rev. N. P. Weckel, Louisville, Ohio; Rev. Jos. L. N. Wolfe, S.T.L., Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. August R. Zylla, Detroit, Mich.;

Redemptorist Fathers, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Brother John Black, S.M., San Antonio, Texas; Rev. Mother M. Casimir, A.B., Scranton, Pa.; Rev. Sister M. Dafrose, O.S.D., Ph.D., Long Island, N. Y.; Rev. Mother St. Rose, St. Paul, Minn.; Sisters of the Visitation, Wheeling, W. Va.; Mr. Charles Decker, Narberth, Pa.; Mr. William M. T. Gamble, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Henry C. Magee, Oaklyn, N. J.; Miss Mary E. Parke, Detroit, Mich.; Dr. Leo F. Stock, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. David E. Stott, Detroit, Mich.; Mt. St. Bendict Council, 75, K. of C., Somerville, Mass.; *Our Sunday Visitor*, Huntington, Ind.; Saint Joseph's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Library, College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn.

The classification of the membership shows the following: Cardinals, 3; Archbishops, 12; Bishops, 62; Monsignori, 33; Priests, 260; Brothers, 1; Sisters, 24; Laity, 104; and institutions, 18. The total membership as of December 31, 1926, is 517. By States, the number of members is as follows:

Alabama	0
Alaska	1
Arkansas	1
Arizona	0
California	14
Canada	5
Colorado	2
Connecticut	12
Delaware	3
District of Columbia	49
Florida	1
Georgia	4
Idaho	2
Illinois	28
Indiana	10
Iowa	15
Kansas	8
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	5
Maine	2
Maryland	21
Massachusetts	29

Michigan	18
Minnesota	12
Mississippi	1
Missouri	25
Montana	3
Nebraska	7
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	3
New Jersey	13
New Mexico	1
New York	53
North Carolina	2
North Dakota	0
Ohio	41
Oklahoma	3
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	63
Rhode Island	3
South Carolina	6
South Dakota	1
Tennessee	2
Texas	13
Utah	1
Vermont	0
Virginia	2
Washington	4
West Virginia	3
Wisconsin	10
Wyoming	1
Europe and Asia	5

The Report of the Treasurer (as of December 1, 1926) follows:

Balance December 19, 1925	$4,545.43
Balance includes $2,000 in Liberty Bonds	2,000.00
Actual balance on hand December 19, 1925	$2,545.43
Balance on hand	$2,545.43

Receipts:

Life Membership	$ 150.00	
Annual Dues	1,834.15	
Interest, Liberty Bonds and Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., $22.50	107.50	
Interest on Bank Deposits	35.47	
Refund from Expense money for Ann Arbor Convention	25.51	
One-half purchase price of new typewriter, paid by Dr. Guilday	37.76	
From Editor of *Thought* for reprint	28.00	
Total Receipts	$2,218.39	$2,218.39
		$4,763.82

Expenditures:

Expense of Office Supplies and Service	$ 676.39	
Expense of Meetings (Ann Arbor Meeting)	562.86	
Investment (Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky.)	1,000.00	
Bank charges on above investment	18.00	
Catholic Historical Review	1,074.21	
American Historical Association *Writings on American History*	50.00	
P. J. Kenedy & Son (*Church Historians*)	30.56	
Wickersham Printing Co. for *Chronicle*	62.90	
Total Expenditures	$3,474.92	

Recapitulation:

Total Receipts	$4,763.82
Total Expenditures	3,474.92
Balance	$1,288.90

Investments:

$2,000 in Liberty Bonds.
$1,000 Note in Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky.

C. F. THOMAS, *Treas.*

The public session on Tuesday, December 28, consisted of two papers. The one on *Prince Gallitzin* by Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, the first President of the Association, was the result of many years of research here and abroad and was a far more profound treatment of the Prince-Priest than those found in the biographies by Father Heyden or Miss Brownson. So extensive were the researches made by Dr. Flick that, owing to the limited time, only an abstract could be given. The larger paper will appear shortly in the REVIEW. The second essay on *Catholic Historical Scholarship in the United States* by the Very Rev. Francis E. Tourscher, O.S.A., Ph.D., of Villanova College, was a tribute to two of our foremost lay Catholic historians, Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan and John Gilmary Shea.

At the last moment, Father Francis S. Betten, S.J., of the John Carroll University, Cleveland, who was to preside over the luncheon conference of Tuesday on the question of a *Reading Book of Church History,* was obliged to telegraph his inability to be present, owing to illness. A large group, however, had luncheon in the Blue Room of the Bellevue-Stratford, and those present were addressed by the Right Reverend Monsignor Henry T. Drumgoole, D.D., of Philadelphia, to whom the Church in the United States is indebted for initiating the great collection of records of Catholic soldiers, sailors, and marines of the World War, which are now housed in the historical bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, D. C.

The Public Meeting of the Association was held on Tuesday evening by the courtesy of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania at its headquarters, 1300 Locust Street. Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue presided. Dr. Guilday spoke on the work of the Association, and said in part: "With this Public Session and before this distinguished assembly, the American Catholic Historical Association is bringing to a close its Seventh Annual Meeting. For the second time in our short span we have had

the honor of being the guests of the American Catholic Historical Society, out of whose long life and labors the past forty years we may well be said to have sprung, and for the second time also we have been welcomed in this auditorium by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. . . . There are many aspects of the work being accomplished by historical scholars in this country which are of particular significance to all who are devoted to the progress of higher learning in the United States. It would be perfectly in keeping with the honor the Historical Society of Pennsylvania confers on us this evening to place this century-old organization before you for your support and interest. It would be specially within my province as a former president of the American Catholic Historical Society to speak to you about the rare collection of books and manuscripts now housed in the home of that Society, and to urge upon all of you to share in the work of carrying on the Society during this and the next generation. Even more so might I speak in behalf of the American Catholic Historical Association, one of the youngest of our American learned societies, and the only organization of its kind in the English-speaking world, and of which with great generosity my friends consider me the Founder.

"But I shall ask you to permit me to forego all these in order to emphasize a want, not indeed more pressing, but certainly more urgent.

"The American Historical Association is holding at Rochester, N. Y., during these days its 41st Annual Meeting. For some years its leaders have been seriously preoccupied with the problem of what has all the appearance of a decline in the nature and quantity of historical research. As a result, for example, of a questionnaire sent out recently to more than 500 historians, it is evident that historical scholarship is being badly handicapped in this country for want of financial support. At the meeting last year in Ann Arbor, the Executive Council of the American Historical Association announced the opening of a million-dollar campaign. Senator Beveridge is national chairman, and the whole country has been divided into districts for this purpose. Your local committee has already been appointed and the work of raising the Pennsylvania quota has been begun.

"It is this endowment which I place with special emphasis

before you this evening. It may seem strange that the Secretary of the American Catholic Historical Association should in this most important of our yearly sessions stress the work of the great national society, made up, as it is, so largely of non-Catholics; but it is because we of the Catholic Association know and have experienced the high scholarship, the utter absence of anything that even hints at narrowness or intolerance in its leadership, and because we have always had its whole-hearted coöperation in what the Catholic Association is striving to do, that with the consent and approval of our officers I take and take gladly this opportunity of holding up for your emulation and support the work of the American Historical Association and its present campaign for financial endowment.

"History is something more than the meeting-ground of all the sciences—it is the home of all who are lovers of the truth; it is the one hearth and fireside where we can all meet irrespective of past events which may have left cleavages, socially, politically, and religiously, in the ranks of humanity. History, or at least, a certain kind of historical writing, is responsible to a large extent for the many divisions of a national, racial or religious kind which keep men apart. But history possesses within its own soul the power of lessening all these barriers and the life-giving forces that must eventually dispel the clouds of doubt, suspicion and of error, which still hover over the field of scholarship.

"Side by side with this national society, the American Historical Association, and supported by such excellent organizations as the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, the American Catholic Historical Association will go on its chosen way, bringing the hidden things of our Catholic past to the light, and warming the hearts of all men with a width of outlook and of sympathy for the great Church of the ages. To all who have made this Seventh Annual Meeting so signal a success, to the Chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee, Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue, and to the other Committees of Reception and of Information, and especially to our hosts, the members of the local Catholic Historical Society, the American Catholic Historical Association shall ever be grateful."

The principal attraction of the evening was the address made

by the Hon. Michael J. Ryan on *Thomas FitzSimons*. Eloquence of a rare quality and historical scholarship made of this address one that can never be forgotten by those present. The presidential address by Dr. Parker Thomas Moon captivated all with its genial humor. After welcoming to the platform the incoming President of the Association, Mr. Clarence E. Martin, Dr. Moon spoke of the progress of the Association during the past year. "The value of the work the Association," he said, "is doing, has received the most indisputable of all endorsements—the practical endorsement of 141 new members. This large increase of membership in the year 1926 is surely an indication that the American Catholic Historical Association is no ephemeral thing, no creation of a passing enthusiasm, but a deep-rooted institution, gaining in vigor and size as it grows in age. The strength of such an association as ours depends on the reality of the service it renders. . . . I would emphasize a service which would be heartily appreciated by historical laymen like myself, a service which might be rendered by some of the scholars I see in this audience. In addition to the notable works of scholarship which have been produced, or are being produced, there is a need, it seems to me, for an effort to make available to the general public not only the general history of the Church, and not only the history of the Church in America, but also the bearing of Church history on some of the foremost problems with which the twentieth century has to grapple. My own work lies more in the field of secular history than of Church history; but I am often asked, and I often ask myself, what has been the attitude of the Church, or what has been the relation of the Church, to this or that one of the great movements which have made modern history. . . . One of these historic movements has been the rise of organized labor and of socialism. We know that the Holy See has spoken on that subject, repeatedly. We know that in many countries organized Catholic efforts have been made to meet the labor problem. Some of those efforts have been studied in detail. But to say that this field of research is not yet exhausted would be putting it too mildly. An immense and an important labor remains to be performed. Another topic on which more light would be welcome is the history of the attitude of the Church towards democracy. Dr. John A. Ryan and Dr. Millar

made an important contribution in their book *The State and the Church*, even though the volume did not profess to be complete or final. I note that one of their crucial contentions, regarding the influence of Cardinal Bellarmine's ideas on the Declaration of Independence, was challenged yesterday by Professor Schaff at the conference of the American Society of Church History. Professor Schaff maintains that the theory of popular sovereignty was of Calvinist rather than Jesuit origin; that it was developed in Calvinist Geneva and spread by the Huguenots, the Dutch and the English settlers in America. Doubtless Catholic historians will have a reply to make to assertions such as that of Dr. Schaff. But such controversies are only part of the task.

"Another part of that task is collecting and giving historical interpretation to the utterances of the Holy See on the question of the proper form of government. Some of the papal pronouncements sounded harshly in the ears of a generation that desired to make political democracy a dogma of faith. I suspect that we are now in a better position to appreciate the wisdom of the Vatican's attitude. Since the war there has been a tendency to put more emphasis where the Holy See has put it, on the just and effective operation rather than on the form of government.

"Another phase of the story of Catholicism and democracy, a phase that calls for laborious historical research, is the part that Catholic organizations and Catholic parties have taken in the politics of modern nations. Particularly interesting, I fancy, would be the account of the rôle which the Austrian and German Catholics have played in holding the balance of power between reactionaries and revolutionaries, and in assuring to their countries governments that were democratic and socially minded, but not communist.

"I feel impelled to mention one other great problem of our age, toward which the Catholic Church has a most significant relationship. It is the problem of international relations. Too often one encounters the view that the Catholic Church has taken little interest in the crusade against war and the movement for peace. That may be true of individual Catholics, but

to assert that it is true of the Catholic Church as a whole is to reveal one's ignorance.

"Just the other day a distinguished German professor told me that he believed three powerful factors were directing Germany in the path of peace and reconciliation. One factor was organized labor; the second was big business with its policy of international trusts; and the third was the Catholic or Center party. That statement is the more interesting because it comes from a non-Catholic, a well-informed and fair-minded Protestant.

"In America, this past year has witnessed the inauguration of what promises to be an important effort of the National Catholic Welfare Conference to promote an intelligent Catholic interest in international problems, and thus to strengthen the Catholic influence for international justice and peace. The Catholic Conference on International Relations held at Cleveland last autumn was a gratifying step in this direction. But the Cleveland Conference was not the beginning of Catholic activity in international relations. The history of the efforts of the Church to restrain aggressive warfare and to curb brute force may be traced back through the centuries through the middle ages to ancient times. The recent chapters of that history are particularly worthy of study. And they can be written well only by scholars trained in the methods of Church history, familiar with the organization, language, and procedure of the Roman Curia. They ought not to be written on the basis of backstairs gossip. On my bookshelves I have a little volume written by Maurice Pernot on the Holy See and World Politics—*Le Saint Siège, l'Eglise Catholique et la Politique Mondiale*, that gives a wealth of interesting, and sometimes spicy, hearsay information and misinformation about papal diplomacy. Must we rely on hearsay? Could not some competent scholar, or scholars, give us an accurate, documented record of what Pius X and Benedict XV did and said during the Great War to hasten the end of hostilities and to urge a peace of justice and reconciliation rather than one of vengeance? The pleas of Benedict XV for a "just and durable peace," and above all his appeal of August 1, 1917, urging disarmament, arbitration, freedom of the seas, mutual condonation of war costs, and a conciliatory settlement of territorial boundaries, had more influence than we knew at the

time, in stimulating peace overtures; and as we look back over them now, in the light of recent events, they have a truly prophetic ring. And to the story of what the papacy did during the war, it might be possible to add the historic utterances of Pius XI on international questions, and a record of the international relief work carried on under his patronage.

"If a Church historian could undertake these things, and also the policy of the Church in recognizing new nationalities, and possibly the attitude shown by the Church in her missions toward the backward nations, and her international relief work, and kindred topics, he would have materials for a masterpiece. I believe that Catholics themselves would be astonished at the breadth, and wisdom, and patience of the efforts made by the Church to pour her sacred oil of charity into the wounds of a war-stricken world."

In his annual report the Secretary, Dr. Guilday, briefly outlined the foundation and progress of the Association, and then, placed before the members the following questions:

> Were we able to call together on this occasion all who were present that December morning in 1919, when we were founded, and to turn back the pages of our seven years' retrospect, certain questions might well be proposed at the end of this first stage of our journey:
>
> I. Have we justified our purpose in establishing a separate Society for the study of general Catholic history?
>
> II. Have these seven years been years of fidelity to our ideals?
>
> III. Is there in the retrospect the promise of a future that shall not lack fulfillment?
>
> IV. Has the Association been supported by the Catholic scholars and students of the United States?
>
> V. What is the programme for the future?

A glance at the portly volume published in 1905 by the American Historical Association, containing a *Bibliography of American Historical Societies*, reveals the fact

that up to that date there were in existence almost five hundred voluntary organizations devoted to the study of history. This number has been augmented during the past twenty years. We are face to face with a remarkable factor in the cultural movement of our country, when we realize that there are more historical societies in the United States than in any other country of the world. Some of these have reached a venerable age, such as the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, which has already passed the century mark. Among the younger Societies now advancing towards the half-century mark, there are two which have a particular relationship to our Association.

The first of these is the American Historical Association. This is our chief national society for the study of general history. Catholic scholars have always been welcome in its ranks and the welcome has always been a generous one. Catholic scholars are given liberal opportunity of participating in the annual meetings and in the discussions. But papers on distinctly Catholic subjects cannot be given a place in the Annual Reports. Since 1889, these are Government publications, and as such are limited to non-political and non-sectarian subjects. This limitation obviously has its influence on the choice of papers for the annual meetings.

It was quite obvious at the outset that the organization of the American Catholic Historical Association would appear to some to be unnecessary, owing to the existence of this historical group, national in name and devoted for so many years past to the progress of historical study in the United States. This delicate problem the founders of the new association met quite openly and honestly at Cleveland, in 1919. With regard to the American Historical Association, it was hoped that the relations between the two societies would always be cordial, even intimate. The American Catholic Historical Association decided to meet each year in the same city and in the same headquarters with the American Historical Association. An experience of seven years with these meetings

has proven quite conclusively that the non-Catholics who come to these annual gatherings are in the fullest sympathy with Catholic historical scholarship and are anxious to avoid all historical bias; and if one can judge the spirit of the members of the American Historical Association by the constant inquiries and requests for guidance in subjects touching the Church, it can be stated in all fairness that no learned group in the United States will welcome more eagerly students and teachers of history. This is especially true of those interested in medieval history; for all realize, as Dr. Jameson has said, that medieval history with the Catholic Church omitted, would be almost "Hamlet" with Hamlet left out. The non-existence of such a national body as the American Catholic Historical Association has left non-Catholic scholars without an authoritative guide in this field. In the synchronous meetings of the two Associations, Catholics and non-Catholics meet on a ground familiar to both, and both gain accordingly. There is no duplication of effort, but mutual assistance, mutual encouragement, a healthier scholarship on both sides, and a more careful appraisal of the past.

Five of our seven meetings since 1919 have been held in conjunction with the Association—Washington, D. C. (1920), St. Louis (1921), New Haven (1922), Columbus (1923), and Ann Arbor, Michigan (1925). We have been fortunate in having been able to hold our sessions in the same headquarters with the national Association, and especially so in the assistance generously given to us by the Committee on Local Arrangements in these annual meetings. The presence of the American Catholic Historical Association has always been a welcome one, and there has been an interchange of courtesies which more than any other factor in our history has given us encouragement and guidance. At the annual banquets, in many of the luncheon conferences, and in the public receptions, the committees in charge of these functions have always given the American Catholic Historical Association a prominent and honorable place in the programme.

We owe this not alone to the cordial good-will of the leaders in the national Association but also to a scholarly interest and coöperation in our work of bringing to the light the hidden glories of the Catholic Church's past which has always been sincere.

To another organization, under whose gracious auspices we have held two of our meetings here in Philadelphia, the American Catholic Historical Society, we are indebted for our progress. The soul of the American Catholic Historical Society, Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, the first President of our Association, has been the actual guide of our work since its inception. All through these seven years, it has been Dr. Flick to whom we have gone for light and direction in the many and varied problems that have arisen. Always patient and considerate, with almost fifty years of experience in the field upon which to base his judgments, Dr. Flick has been the mainstay of the official family of the Association. To him more than to anyone else we owe whatever success these years may lay claim to.

The first President (1920) of the Association was Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, of Philadelphia. Dr. Flick was succeeded (1921) by Dr. James J. Walsh, K.S.G., of New York City. The third President (1922) was Robert Howard Lord, Ph.D., then Associate Professor of Modern European History at the University of Harvard. Dr. Lord became a Catholic in 1920. In September, 1926, Dr. Lord resigned his post at Harvard University, and entered St. John's Seminary, Boston, to begin his studies for the priesthood. Dr. Lord was succeeded (1923) by Charles Hallan McCarthy, Ph.D., professor of American History at the Catholic University of America, and the first incumbent of the Knights of Columbus Chair of History in the University. The fifth President (1924) was Gaillard Hunt, LL.D., who became a Catholic in 1901, and who edited the publications of the Department of State at Washington, D. C., until his death of March 20, 1924. The Acting-President during the rest of the year was Henry Jones Ford, Ph.D., professor emeritus of Politics at Princeton University,

who became a Catholic in 1919. Dr. Ford, who became the sixth President (1925) of the Association, died on August 29, 1925. Parker Thomas Moon, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of International Relations, Columbia University, who was received into the Church in 1915, succeeded Dr. Ford and was elected at the Ann Arbor Meeting as President for the current year of 1926.

Among the Vice-Presidents of the Association have been: Rev. Richard H. Tierney, S.J., the first editor of *America;* Rev. John J. Wynne, the editor of the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* the founder of *Universal Knowledge,* now in course of publication, and the promoter of the cause of the Jesuit Martyrs of North America, who were beatified last year by the Holy See; Mr. Richard M. Reilly, K.S.G., of Lancaster, Pa., who has done much to revive historical interest in the Catholic history of Pennsylvania; Rev. Victor O'Daniel, O.P., the well-known historian of the Dominican Order in this country; the Very Rev. Dr. M. S. Ryan, C.M., former President of Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.; the Hon. Daniel Joseph Donahoe, one of the foremost hymnologists in the United States; Dr. Leo Francis Stock, of the Catholic University, whose scholarly publication on *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments Respecting North America* have been recently issued by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D. C.; the Very Rev. Felix Fellner, of the Benedictine Archabbey of St. Vincent, who has spent a lifetime collecting rare and scarce material here and abroad for American Catholic history; and Mr. Clarence E. Martin, of Martinsburg, W. Va., who brought to the office of Vice-President a vigorous and enlightened enthusiasm for the cause of Catholic history, and who now succeeds Dr. Moon as President of the Association.

There have been two treasurers: The Right Rev. Monsignor Thomas C. O'Reilly, D.D., of Cleveland, whom we all regard as the actual founder of the Association, occupied this post from 1919 to 1921; and the Right Rev. Monsignor C. F. Thomas, D.D., V.F., of Washington, D. C., who has been treasurer the past five years.

The first Secretary of the Association was Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, of Columbia University. Owing to the many demands

upon his time both here and abroad, Dr. Hayes relinquished the post after a year and was succeeded by the present incumbent, who has been assisted during the past six years by Rev. Dr. Edwin J. Ryan, Dr. Richard Purcell, Dr. Stanislaus de Torosiewicz, all members of the faculty of the Catholic University, and by the Rev. Dr. Edward J. Hickey, Professor of Church history at the Seminary of Detroit, who is the present Assistant Secretary. Allied to the office of the Secretary is that of the Archivist. Miss Frances Brawner, Archivist of the Catholic University, held this post from 1921 to 1925. The Archivist at present is Miss Frances Louise Trew, who relinquished an important post at the Library of Congress to devote herself to this important part of our organization.

There have been since 1920 twenty members of the Executive Council. Among these special mention should be made of the Rev. Francis S. Betten, S.J., of the John Carroll University, Cleveland, who brought to our councils a wealth of knowledge in medieval ecclesiastical history; the late Dean of American Catholic historians, Father Thomas J. Campbell, S.J.; the Rev. Francis P. Siegfried, of Overbrook Seminary, to whose training in scholastic philosophy almost all the secular clergy of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia are indebted; the Rev. Dr. Charles M. Souvay, C.M., of Kenrick Seminary, one of the founders of the St. Louis Catholic Historical Society, and the postulator of the cause of Mother Seton and Father Felix De Andreis for canonization; and the Right Rev. Monsignor Francis X. Wastl, D.D., to whom so much of the credit for the splendid American Catholic pageant of the recent Sesquicentennial is due.

A longer list awaits the future historian of the Association—those who have read papers in the seven annual meetings. Apart from this meeting, ninety-two papers have been read in our public sessions since 1920, by Catholic and non-Catholic scholars from every section of the United States. Of these twenty-eight have dealt with problems of ancient and medieval Church history, twenty-nine with modern and contemporary European history, fifteen on questions of historical research, criticism, and composition, and twenty on various phases of American Catholic history. Over half of these papers have appeared in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, the official organ of the

Association, and fourteen of the papers read at the Ann Arbor Meeting last year were recently published in book form by Messrs. P. J. Kenedy & Sons of New York City, with the title *Church Historians.*

The success of the seventh annual meeting is due wholly to the generous coöperation of the Committees. The Committee on Local Arrangements, the honorary chairmanship of which was generously accepted by His Eminence, Cardinal Dougherty, the Archbishop of Philadelphia, and of which Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue was Chairman, consisted of the following ladies and gentlemen of Philadelphia: Robert T. Bicknell, James J. Breen, Miss Katherine Bregy, Hon. Francis Shunk Brown, J. J. Cabrey, Miss Jane Campbell, Charles T. Carpenter, Vincent A. Carroll, Samuel J. Castner, Miss Ada Dallett, Ashton Devereux, George B. Donnelly, Michael F. Donoghue, Joseph F. Donovan, Edward J. Dooner, Michael Francis Doyle, Joseph L. Durkin, Walter T. Fahy, C. Gerald Fenerty, Miss Gertrude Fetterman, James Fitzpatrick, James A. Flaherty, Samuel S. Fleisher, Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, James P. Fogarty, Edward J. Galbally, Dr. T. D. J. Gallagher, Hon. Joseph P. Gaffney, Walter B. Gibbons, Philip A. Hart, John I. Henderson, Mrs. James R. Hirst, Franklin S. Horn, Ignatius J. Horstmann, John F. Huneker, N. Scammon-Jones, Charles F. Kelley, Hon. Joseph F. Lamorelle, Mrs. John P. Leigo, J. A. Lanahan, Mrs. Robert W. Lesley, Hon. J. Willis Martin, Dr. D. J. McCarthy, Hon. Joseph P. McCullen, Hon. Harry S. McDevitt, M. J. McEnery, William J. McGlinn, Eugene McGuckin, Mrs. Henry B. McIntire, Thomas McKean, Miss Ann Ingersoll Meigs, Frederick J. Mitchell, Effingham B. Morris, Hon. Roland S. Morris, Dr. P. F. Moylan, Mr. D. J. Murphy, Mrs. Marguerite Eagan Nathan, Mrs. John S. Newbold, Hon. George W. Norris, Dr. Austin O'Malley, Louis E. Pequignot, Mrs. James L. Pequignot, M. P. Quinn, Miss Agnes Repplier, Miss Emilie M. Rivinus, E. F. Rivinus, Dr. John F. Roderer, James J. Ryan, Hon. Michael J. Ryan, Hon. Frank Smith, Miss Helen Grace Smith, Thomas Kilby Smith, James J. Sullivan, John J. Sullivan, Dr. I. P. Strittmatter, Theodore A. Tack, Dr. Joseph Walsh, James M. Willcox, Mrs. Honor Walsh.

The Committee on Registration and Information was composed of five ladies: Mrs. Daniel C. Donoghue, Chairman, Mrs.

Robert T. Bicknell, Mrs. Ashton Devereux, Mrs. Robert W. Lesley, Mrs. Henry B. McIntyre, Miss Anne Mullarkey, Secretary. The Committee on Reception consisted of: Mrs. Samuel J. Castner, Chairman, Mrs. James L. Pequignot, Miss Emilie Rivinus, Miss Helen Grace Smith, Miss Margaret Guilday, Secretary.

It was felt by many present at the sessions that this seventh annual meeting represented an important starting point for the future. The generous welcome granted to *Church Historians* by many of the prominent historical scholars and reviews has had a significant encouragement to the officers and members of the Association. It may be well, before glancing into the future, to stress the fact that the American Catholic Historical Association is the only society in the world founded by Catholics devoting itself exclusively to the study of general or world-wide Church history. Two other Catholic Societies, the one in Germany, the other in Austria, have been founded for the study of all the ecclesiastical sciences and have already published many important works in the field of Church history. The first of these is the Görres Society established in 1876 as a centennial tribute to that great German scholar, Johann Joseph Görres. The Görres Society has departments of law, natural sciences, jurisprudence, philosophy, literature and history, and has issued since 1880 the quarterly *Historisches-Jahrbuch*, and since 1900, the *Studies and Essays in History*. In 1889, it founded an Historical Institute at Rome, now housed in the Campo Santo dei Tedeschi, where twelve scholars (all priests) are maintained. Probably its most outstanding historical works are the *Staatslexicon* (1887-1897) and the *Concilium Tridentinum*, which began in 1901. The second of these Societies is the Leo Society founded in Vienna in 1892, which pursues aims similar to the Görres Society, including practically all branches of learning in its field of activity. Church history has received considerable attention from this learned group and its members have published some of the most popular works in ecclesiastical history in our day.

In attempting then to forecast the work to be done by the Association, the fact that it is practically alone in the field and that it is the only organization of Catholics in the English-

speaking world for the study of general Church history must be kept in view.

A first necessity is a Union Catalogue of all rare and scarce works on Church historical subjects in all the libraries, Catholic and non-Catholic, in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. A second necessity is the purchase and housing at some central place in close proximity to one of the greater libraries of the United States, such as the Library of Congress, the Harvard Library, or New York Public Library, of all other rare and scarce works on Church history which the student would need for his researches. There never was a more propitious time in our generation for the purchase of these books, and if the Association were to decide upon one central library for their housing, there are many scholars and men of wealth who would donate rare and scarce books for this purpose. A common catalogue of these rare and scarce publications should be prepared and placed in all the important libraries of this country, Canada and Mexico.

There should be in one place a Complete Collection of all Published Sources in the field of Church History. These have multiplied beyond the counting within the past half century, and if one single library contained them all, the advantages to scholarship would be probably the most notable contribution possible.

For the student and general reader scarcely any single volume might be chosen of more immediate value than a *Manual of Church Historical Literature*. The American Historical Association Committee on Bibliography is publishing some time next year a revised and enlarged edition of Charles Kendell Adams' *Manual of Historical Literature*, and every effort has been made to include in this new volume all the outstanding works by Catholic historians. But we need a *Manual* devoted exclusively to Church history, one which will contain a critical summary of the best works in all languages in the field.

Research work to make any advance should begin where the last scholar laid down his pen. For this reason, as well as to avoid duplication of effort, there should be a general Bibliography of Church History containing a well-selected catalogue of all published sources and works in that field. No one scholar

can do this work. It is true that Stein has given us in his *Manuel de Bibliographie Générale* a handy guide to all sciences, but we are sorely in need of a volume containing a directive critical estimate of the source-material of Church history.

Many other volumes are badly wanted—manuals of Church history for the colleges, academies, and grades, written from the American viewpoint; reading books in all periods of Church history for the schools; and geographies of Church history, national and general. It might be considered too presumptuous to suggest also that the time is ripe during this post-war period for a great coöperative history of the Church by the foremost scholars of the world to be published by our Association. There are vast tracts of Church history which are not known as they should be to American scholars, particularly the Church in China, in the near East, in central Asia and Northern Africa. Also the Church history of Mexico, Central America, and of the Republics of South America awaits its revelation to Catholics and non-Catholics of our country. Our own American Church history records are lying for the most part in archives here and abroad awaiting the action of some generous-minded Catholics who will establish a great series of Ecclesiastical Annals for the United States. Much has been done, particularly by local Catholic Historical Societies, as the forty volumes of the Philadelphia *Records and Researches* show, but we have but barely touched the surface of these source-materials. Another field of which we know only too little is the history of the Catholic missions throughout the world. A more immediate and practical want in the progress of ecclesiastical history in this country is the creation of an endowment of sufficient strength to allow the Association to place skilled teachers of Church history in all the high schools, academies, colleges and universities in the Catholic educational system of the United States, and the creation of an Institute of Church History for the training of these teachers.

History has been for the past four hundred years the battleground of the Christian Churches. If the East is separated from the West, it is largely due to the continuance of an historical tradition in the minds of Greek and Russian Orthodox Christians which bars the way to enlightenment. If the many Christian Churches of the West are separated from the Roman See, it is

largely due to the historical works which came from the earliest of these groups and which have brought forth with the years an ever-increasing progeny.

All sincere and devout men and women desire peace in this busy, work-a-day world in which we live: peace between the nations of the world; peace between the citizens of every nation; peace with all with whom we live and move and have our being; and peace within our own hearts. All that disturbs our peace, all that shuts the doors of our hearts to our neighbors—and to-day the whole vast world has become but one neighborhood—just by so much hinders progress, intellectual, cultural, and social, and adds to the burdens succeeding generations of men and women must carry.

Nothing has helped more to create divisions, suspicions, envies, jealousies and hatreds in every quarter of the globe than history misapplied to life and misused for racial, national, or religious purposes. The long story of historical writing would be a barren page if the historiographer failed to record the successes of history in sowing the seed of disunity everywhere. What has thus been done in a spirit of animosity, whether political or religious, can be and should be undone by a devotion to historical truth which can and will create a fuller and more comprehensive kinship among all folk who look back upon the past of humanity and who recognize that in that past lie all the beginnings of the present, with its good and its evil, its blessings and its unrest.

This is the ideal out of whose heart rose the American Catholic Historical Association. Seven years have passed since its founding, and in those seven years we are justified in witnessing a great promise of scholarship that shall redound to the glory of our country, our Faith, and the immortal cause of truth.

THE PAPACY AND HISPANIC INTERSTATE RELATIONS, 1195-1212*

From the eleventh to the thirteenth century the evolution of the map of Spain shows, in general, a tendency for the states whose rulers were of Christian faith to occupy an increasingly larger area of the Iberian Peninsula, while the territory ruled by Moslems grows correspondingly smaller. Progress in this direction was, of course, by no means steady or continuous, but the territory controlled by the Christian states was vastly greater in 1200 than it had been in 1000. Although the decentralizing or disintegrating factors which at times made the Moslem states an easier prey than Christian neighbors, will not be discussed here, it is well to be reminded that the growth of the Christian powers was not the result of a crusade; that is, if by a crusade we mean a concerted effort in which elements of otherwise divergent interests were united under the symbol of the Christian faith. Out of the unconquered remnant of the old Gothic kingdom, several small dynasties had arisen. Each was ambitious to increase its inheritance and was ready to do this at the expense of its weakest neighbor, whether Moslem or Christian.

At the end of the twelfth century the Christian states were five in number, Aragon, Navarre, Castile, Leon and Portugal. Castile, Leon and Portugal were all ruled by kings descended from Alfonso VI, King of Leon, Galicia and Castile from 1083 to 1109. A bitter dynastic rivalry existed between Portugal and Leon, for the former had originally been established as a fief of the latter,[1] and had won the status of an independent kingdom through war and through diplomatic enlistment of papal support. The king of Leon was also a natural rival of his cousin, the king of Castile, whose vassal he nominally was. In fact there existed a general suspicion of the king of Castile, for it was apparently feared that the pretensions of Alfonso VII to peninsular empire might be renewed.

As a result the late eighties and early nineties of the twelfth century had seen a general alliance among the Christian states

*Published by courtesy of the Editor of *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters*, Ann Arbor.

1 More strictly as a fief of Galicia, which remained united with Leon from the time of Alfonso VII of Castile, Leon and Galicia (1126-1157).

against Castile. An interdynastic marriage temporarily lulled even the bitter strife between Leon and Portugal,[2] and in 1195 Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158-1214) found himself isolated before the Moslem armies by whom he was bitterly defeated at the tragic battle of Alarcos (July 19).

Although, as has been pointed out, the spirit of the crusade was not the leading factor in the statecraft of the Spanish princes, it is not to be left out of account entirely. It afforded added zest to war against the Moslems and often served, together with the hope of plunder or the promise of a fief, to bring from Northern Europe the help of some adventurous warrior.

It is said that the news of the disaster at Alarcos stunned Europe. To estimate the effect of an event on public opinion is more difficult for the twelfth than for the twentieth century, but in the years immediately following the disaster there is evidence of a much more vigorous effort on the part of the reigning pope to unify the Christian princes against Islam.

On the 29th of March, 1196, Celestine III addressed a note to Sancho VIII, the duke of Navarre. The divine wrath of God has permitted the infidel to win a victory over Christendom and there is need for concerted action among the Christian powews. Celestine has learned that Sancho has entered a compact with the Moslems, agreeing in return for an annual payment to refuse aid to the Christian kings "at this critical time" (*in hujus necessitatis articulo*). He urges him to desert this alliance and join with the "kings of the Spains" (*reges Ispaniarum*), and especially those of Castile and Aragon, in an alliance on terms which he proceeds to specify. The pact is to be sponsored by ecclesiastical and lay dignitaries, headed by Gregory, cardinal deacon of Sant' Angelo, Celestine's legate. These are to see to it that an equitable division is made of any land captured from the Moslems. The duke of Navarre is to be guaranteed free access to the Moslem frontiers for purposes of carrying war against them and also to whatever conquered territory

2 For an account of the circumstances surrounding this marriage and the questions of chronology involved, see HERCULANO, *Historia de Portugal*, 2:67, and n. 2. SCHIRRMACHER, *Geschichte von Spanien*, 4:244 and 249. It appears that the marriage was solemnized in the spring of 1191 and soon thereafter declared illegal on grounds of consanguinity.

may be allotted to him.[3] Corresponding letters went forward to Cardinal Gregory,[4] to the kings of Aragon and Castile[5] and to three Spanish bishops.[6]

To clinch the adherence of Sancho of Navarre to the cause of Christendom, he is dignified by the pope with the title of "king" and is so addressed in a letter of April 22, 1196, wherein he is reminded that the added dignity of his new title entails upon him a heavier obligation.[7]

Of all the Iberian states Navarre alone was cut off by her neighbors from contact with the Moslems. Pinched between the relatively powerful states of Castile and Aragon, it was natural that she should find an ally in the more remote Moslem power.

In her policy of alliance with Islam she had a companion among her fellow-Christians. With a relatively narrow frontier against the infidel and a long neck of territory extending between an only temporarily pacified Portugal and a never-to-be-trusted Castile, the king of Leon had sought to seize the opportunity of his cousin's clash with the Moslems to lay hands on Castilian territory.[8]

The marriage which in 1191 had united the houses of Leon and Portugal had promptly been ordered dissolved by Celestine III on grounds of consanguinity. Failing to heed the divorce order, the kings were excommunicated and their lands subjected to an interdict.[9] The separation finally took place in 1195 or early in 1196.[10] In February of 1196 Sancho of Portugal

---

3 Bull of Celestine III, published by FIDEL FITA, "Bulas Historicas de Navarra," *Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 26 (1895):418-420.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 420-423. (This letter is dated May 28, the others are of March 29.)

5 Published by FIDEL FITA, "Bulas Ineditas," *ibid.*, 27 (1895):225-227.

6 *Ibid.*, pp. 227-229.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 229-230.

8 RODRIGO DE TOLEDO, *De Rebus Hisp.*, quoted by FITA, "Bulas Historicas de Navarra," *op. cit.*, 26:417, n. 2.

9 *Inn. III Epist.*, Lib. II No. 75, ed. BALUZE; reprinted in MIGNE, *Patrol. Lat.*, Vol. 214 cols. 610-615.

10 HERCULANO, *op cit.*, 2:75, and n. 4. It is argued (n. 4) that the earlier date is more plausible since the king of Aragon, who came to Coimbra in February of 1196 to make overtures for a new alliance, must have known in advance of the estrangement. It is possible, on the other hand, that the separation was the result, rather than the cause, of the Portuguese king's interest in the new alliance.

was visited by the king of Aragon who was apparently acting as intermediary for the formation of a new alliance.[11] In any case the natural course for King Sancho to follow was to renew his long-standing feud with the king of Leon. In so doing he ranged himself beside the king of Castile, who was still at war with Leon. The enemies of Leon were further strengthened by a bull issued on October 31, 1196, preaching the crusade against the king of Leon and the renegade Castilian, Pedro Fernandez de Castro, who was believed to have been largely responsible for the king's alliance with the Moslems. To those bearing arms against them the same indulgences are offered as to those fighting the infidel.[12] In April, 1197, the king of Portugal received further encouragement from the pope, who authorized him to keep whatever he could take from the outlawed Alfonso IX of Leon.[13]

The effort of Celestine III to unify the Christian kings of Spain against the Moslem power had enjoyed only a limited success. Navarre remained at war with Castile and Aragon and the legate Gregory felt obliged to place an interdict upon her.[14] Portugal, however, became the ally of Castile in 1196 and Pedro II of Aragon, who came to the throne in April of that year was and remained until his death the staunch ally of Alfonso VIII. Thus the alliance against Castile had dissolved and of the five Christian states only two remained hostile to the victim of Alarcos. By the beginning of 1198 one of these two had entered the fold, for a marriage had been effected between Berenguela, daughter of Alfonso VIII of Castile, and King Alfonso IX of Leon.

This marriage, however, was not to serve as a permanent guarantee of peace between the two kingdoms. Shortly after its contraction Celestine was succeeded by Innocent III. Surely this pope, with his ambition to increase the limits of Christendom, must have been ambitious for a triumph of Christian arms in Spain. But first of all his interest was in the establishment

11 HERCULANO, *loc. cit.*, *Schirrmacher, up cit.*, 4:257, and n. 2. Both cite the *Coimbra Chronicle.*

12 Bull of Celestine III, quoted by FITA, "Bulas Historicas de Navarra," *op. cit.*, 26:423-424; also in 11 (1887): 457.

13 Bull of Celestine III in BRANDAO, *Monarchia Lusitanea*, XII, c.

14 *Inn. III Epist.*, Lib. I, No. 92; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 214, col. 80 A.

of ecclesiastical authority and the enforcement of church law. His instructions to his legate, Cardinal Ranier, April 16, 1198, portray the situation. The function of the mission is virtually described in the preamble as the "reëstablishment of peace among the princes and the dissolution of iniquitous unions." The latter, that is the dissolution of the consanguineous marriage between Berenguela and Alfonso of Leon, was the legate's first duty. He is also charged with seeing that the kings make an effective peace with one another and especially with the king of Portugal. In the third place he is to investigate the interdict placed upon the kingdom of Navarre on account of breaking the truce with Castile.[15] In annulling the marriage alliance Innocent met with stubborn resistance.[16] Not until 1204 did Berenguela leave her husband.[17] That did not end the trouble, however. Hostilities between Leon and Castile were renewed because of a dispute over certain castles with which the king of Leon had endowed his bride. These she and her father undertook to retain. Innocent ruled that they should be returned, since the marriage was properly no marriage at all.[18] A peace settlement was finally effected in 1206 according to which the castles were to be deliv-

15 *Ibid.*, 79-80.

16 *Ibid.*, Lib. II, No. 75; MIGNE, *op cit.*, Vol. 214, cols. 610-615; May 25, 1199. The case is reviewed in full. The king of Leon having failed to repudiate his wife was excommunicated and an interdict laid upon his kingdom. The kings of both Leon and Castile had sent ambassadors to Rome whose most cogent argument in favor of a relaxation of the interdict was that it hindered the cause of the crusade. Innocent did relax the extreme severity of the interdict, but refused to remove it.

17 *Ibid., Lib.* VII, No. 67; MIGNE, *op cit.*, Vol. 215, col. 345; May 22, 1204. The archbishop of Toledo and certain bishops are instructed to absolve Berenguela, who has now left Alfonso IX. The king of Leon was similarly absolved, June 19, 1204 (*Ibid.*, Lib. VII, No. 94; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 215, col. 376).

18 *Ibid.*, Lib. II, No. 75, and also Lib. VII, No. 93; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 215, cols. 373-376; June 20, 1204. The disputed castles had been granted by the king of Leon to his bride with the proviso that, should he at any time repudiate her, she should retain them. This accounts for Alfonso IX's unwillingness to repudiate his wife and Alfonso VIII's unwillingness to take her back on any other condition. After the separation Alfonso VIII had responded to Innocent's order to return the castles with the subterfuge that they were occupied by his daughter, not by him. Innocent orders the princess to deliver the castles to Leon or turn them over, in trust, to certain Spanish bishops until the matter can be settled by arbitration.

ered to the joint offspring of the marriage.[19] This settlement, however, was distinctly in opposition to Innocent's wishes, for it involved the recognition of Ferdinand who, according to his interpretation, was born out of wedlock and therefore not entitled to any inheritance.[20]

In every state of Spain Innocent effected a triumph of ecclesiastical authority, but in the larger affairs of the Peninsula, the preparation for the triumphant national effort at Las Navas, his was a guided rather than a guiding hand. His greatest service, perhaps was performed in 1198 when he was able to restrain Castile from joining Leon in the war against Portugal, which continued until 1200.[21]

The situation remained very much that which Celestine III had left. After the rupture of the marriage bond with Castile, the king of Leon once more leaned toward the Moslem alliance. King Sancho VIII of Navarre, too, became effectively estranged from the Christian princes. After Innocent III, again on grounds of consanguinity, had refused to let him marry the sister of Pedro of Aragon (an alliance forced upon him as an alternative to the dismemberment of his kingdom by Castile and

19 Treaty of peace between the kings of Leon and Castile (Peace of Cabreros) in *España Sagrada*, 36:CXXXII. The castles are granted to Ferdinand, son of Alfonso IX and Berenguela. It is specifically stated that they remain a part of the kingdom of Leon and that their lords owe allegiance to her king. This peace was confirmed in 1207 by another agreement (*ibid.*, p. CXLIV) in which the king of Leon assigns certain castles and an annual money payment to his former wife. After her death the castles are to revert to the status described in the peace of 1206. The recognition of Ferdinand was in accord with an agreement entered upon by the two kings some years previously and promptly denounced by Innocent III, *Ep.*, Lib. VI, No. 80; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 215, col. 83 A; June 5, 1203. War broke out again between Castile and Leon as is shown by a third reaffirmation of the peace of Cabreros (*España Sagrada*, 36:*CLXVII*). Further grants are made to Berenguela on the same terms as in 1207. Certain castles which violate the boundary are to be destroyed. The treaty is to be submitted to the pope for ecclesiastical sanction.

20 *Inn. III Epist.*, Lib. II, No. 75; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 214, col. 614C, and also as cited in note 19.

21 *Op. cit.*, Lib. I, No. 249; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 214, col. 214; June 6, 1198. Castile and Leon were then at peace because of the recently contracted marriage alliance. Castile was evidently tempted to join Leon in the war against Portugal. The legate Rainer was charged with the maintenance of peace between the kings of Leon and Portugal. The two monarchs had sworn to a treaty of peace but a short time previously (certainly not before the separation of the Portuguese Infanta from the king of Leon).

Aragon),[22] he sought refuge with the calif and remained for some two years in Africa, while the allies took heavy toll of his tiny kingdom.[23]

As time passed and the burdens of office increased, whatever ambitions toward the organization of a Spanish crusade Innocent may, in his earlier days, have felt, became more remote. In 1204 the king of Aragon, who, even at this time may have been interested in an eventual conquest of the Balearic islands, had urged upon the pope the sending of a legate to organize a crusade among the Spanish kings. But Innocent had learned by his own bitter experience and that of his predecessor that he could not make the Spanish kings of one mind or of one heart, and the sending of the legate was indefinitely postponed.[24] Again in 1209, with the preaching of the Albigensian crusade, the center of Innocent's interest moved to Southern France. A letter was dispatched to the kings of Aragon and Castile, urging their participation and arguing in favor of deserting, for a time, the crusade against the Moslem in favor of that against the northern infidel.[25]

Notwithstanding discouragement the spirit of revenge was still alive in Spain. Both Celestine and Innocent had recognized in Castile, whose monarch smarted from the disgrace at Alarcos and whose territories formed a bold salient into the dominions of Islam, the destined organizer of victory. During the years of controversy over the marriage of Berenguela Innocent had displayed the greatest forbearance toward Alfonso of Castile; Celestine had made Castile with Aragon (the state second in concern for the crushing of the Moslem power) the nucleus of his proposed Christian alliance.

Only once does Innocent become vindictive toward Alfonso VIII. He has apparently discovered that the king of Castile had secretly engaged in negotiations with the king of Leon, involving the recognition of Ferdinand as heir. Alfonso VIII is ac-

22 *Op. cit.*, Lib. I, No. 556; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 214. cols. 509-510; Feb. 11, 1199.

23 LAFUENTE, *Historia general de España*, 5:178-189; SCHIRRMACHER, *op. cit.* 4:266-269. BALLASTEROS Y BERETTA, *Historia de España*, 2:376.

24 *Inn. III Epist.*, Lib. VI, No. 235; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 215, cols. 265-266.

25 *Inn. III Ep.*, Lib. XII, No. 125; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, col. 154.

cused of having ensnared Alfonso IX, playing upon his simplicity and forcing him into a position where he could not, without great loss to himself, repudiate the Castilian Infanta. Castilian counselors are said to have forced upon him and most of the strongest border fortresses occupied by Castilian troops in the name of the Infanta. Alfonso VIII excused himself from vacating the occupied castles on the ground that it was his daughter and not him who was holding them.[26] But these sins are soon forgiven and subsequent letters are again courteous and considerate.

As it became evident that concerted action could not be secured, Alfonso VIII determined to force the hand of Christendom. His eldest son was to win his spurs in battle with the infidel. Innocent could not refuse coldly the appeal of the young prince but satisfied himself in December of 1210, with a somewhat perfunctory letter to the Spanish bishops instructing them to urge upon their monarchs the support of the Castilian enterprise, so far as they had not bound themselves to the Moslems under a truce.[27]

On February 22, 1211, the pope was persuaded to take a somewhat more definite stand. The Spanish bishops are instructed to curb with ecclesiastical censure any king who, having engaged in a truce or treaty of peace with King Alfonso or his son, ventures to violate it while the Castilians are carrying war against the Moslems.[28]

As the cause of Christendom became more deeply involved in the Moslem war and Innocent became persuaded that the infidel sought "not only the destruction of the Spains but even threatened to vent his fury against other Christian lands," the petitions of the Castilians were further answered with the promise (February 4, 1212,) of a recruiting campaign in France and Provence with the inducement of plenary indulgence for all participants. But the letter concludes with the admonition that the world is all upset and in evil times, and the advice to take the first opportunity for a respectable truce and await a more favorable time for a conclusive war.[29]

26 *Ibid.*, Lib. VI, No. 80; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 215, col. 82; June 13, 1203.
27 *Inn. III Ep.*, Lib. XIII, No. 183; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, col. 353.
28 *Ibid.*, Lib. XIV, Nos. 3-5; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, cols. 379-381.
29 *Ibid.*, No. 154; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, col. 513.

Not until after certain successes by the Moslems and the dispatch of another embassy to Rome did Innocent extend to the crusade the full strength of his support. On April 4, 1212, a bull addressed to the archbishops of Compostela and Toledo, ordering the excommunication of the king of Leon "concerning whom specific mention is made" or any other Spanish king presuming to enter an agreement with the Moslems against the Christians.[30]

Innocent had been cautious in his assumption of leadership. At no point had he run the risk of a step he might have to retrace or a threat he could not expect to carry through.

On the 16th of July was won the victory of Las Navas de Toloso. As his allies in the great struggle Alfonso had the king of Aragon; the king of Navarre who after wavering until the eleventh hour was at last persuaded to cast his lot with the Christians; and the king of Portugal. The king of Portugal was unable to be present himself because of disorder at home. He was represented, however, by a contingent of knights. The ultramontanes, who had come in response to the preaching of the crusade in France and Provence, had left the ranks on finding that the heat was great and the hope of plunder small. On Alfonso VIII and on the kingdom of Castile devolved the furnishing of the largest contingent and the financing of the whole campaign.[31]

In this first great successful crusade of the Spanish princes the head of the church had played a somewhat doubtful part. From 1195 to 1198 Celestine had made a magnificent effort to secure the co-operation of the Christian princes. He had helped to form a triple alliance between Castile, Portugal and Aragon, but had succeeded only in emphasizing the cleavage which set apart the kings of Leon and Navarre. His successor, Innocent III, had opened his career with ambitions to control the interrelations of the Hispanic states, but as time went on the independent spirit of the princes and the other burdens of his office led him to be content with the enforcement of ecclesiastical authority in lesser things, such as marriage laws and questions of

30 *Ibid.*, Lib. XV, No. 15; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, col. 553.

31. Alfonso's report to Innocent III, concerning the campaign of Las Navas, *Inn. III Ep.*, Lib. XV, No. 182; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, cols. 699-703.

clerical privilege.[32] Perhaps it was his greater wisdom which prompted him to let the crusade lead him instead of attempting to force it as Celestine had done.

His stamp of approval on the enterprise of the Castilian king was of undoubted help in securing participation almost peninsula-wide.[33] Only the king of Leon remained true to his anti-Castilian and pro-Moslem tendencies.

Alfonso VIII laid his victory in all humility at the feet of Innocent.[34] It was accepted by church and people as a victory of Christendom.[35] In fact it was less and it was more. The king of the great central state of the Iberian Peninsula had successfully led Spanish arms in an enterprise of his own making. It was a great national triumph.

BENJAMIN WEBB WHEELER,
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor.

32 For instances of his repeated humiliation of the Hispanic kings, see LUCHAIRE, *Innocent III, Les Royautés Vassales*, pp. 1-57 *passim*.

33 *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26. Innocent, as executor of the will of Sancho I of Portugal (d. 1212), relaxed his severity toward the new king, Alfonso II. Apparently the change in policy was in the interest of the crusade. (Portugal, however, was more important as a buffer against the hostile king of Leon than as a participant at Las Navas).

34 Alfonso's report as cited in note 31, especially cols. 702 B and 703 A.

35 *Inn. III Ep.*, Lib. XV, No. 183; MIGNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. 216, cols. 703-704.

PRIMITIVE NONCONFORMITY IN WALES

It has long been recognised that the parish-church registers of Great Britain are a valuable, and to a considerable extent unexplored, source for the researches of the historian and that an intelligent study of them throws a deal of light on the life, manners and morals of our forefathers. It is true that their transcription and systematic examination is left to private enterprise to undertake and private purses to pay for, and is therefore sporadic when it should be regular and localised when it should be national: nevertheless their importance and their interest are now realised. Registers of baptisms, marriages and deaths were first ordered to be kept by a parliament of Henry VIII in 1538 and, though few have survived from that time, it is often possible, for example, to trace family pedigrees or the occupancy of a house for many generations. Moreover, contemporary comments are frequently found written against entries, and notable local events, such as a great storm or the fall of the church steeple, recorded in the margins of the books.

For a long period the incumbent, as registrar, had to take cognisance of the births, marriages and deaths not only of his own flock but also of all other folk domiciled in his parish, so that these registers are often of particular importance to Catholics and Dissenters.

But those non-Anglican bodies also had their unofficial registers and records of events affecting their own bodies. With those of Catholic missions I am not concerned—happily we have the Catholic Record Society—but so far as I know little, if any, attention has been paid to those of the various sects of Protestant nonconformity. Obviously these are at least as likely as the official parish-registers to contain matter of value and general interest; and I submit that Catholics might even find particular interest in them: for often were our persecutions and oppressions shared by these other dissenters from the state-church, and nonconforming sects usually had their origin in enthusiasm for purity of religion, an enthusiasm which we can admire and respect even though we know it to have been mistaken in its objects.

We are, I think, prone to think too hardly of the rank and file adherents of schismatical sects within the Church (if I may use the expression) and of protestant bodies outside it. It seems generally that they were more sinned against than sinning; simple, earnest folk, really concerned for God's glory, right life and purity of faith, but in ignorance led away into excesses of schism and heresy for which their leaders only should properly be held responsible. The Lollards of the late XIVth and early XVth centuries, for instance. For the most part they were simple, ignorant folk but good enough Catholics to see and judge for themselves the wealth and undue secular power and unholy pride of too many of the clergy, secular and regular; but their simplicity and ignorance were their weakness as well as their strength, so that they fell into the hands of the first self-appointed reformer who happened to come along, which in this instance was the heretic Wyclif and his "poor preachers"—the people were in good faith and knew no better, but *he* knew well enough what he was doing.

Or, again, the Wesleyan-Methodists of the XVIIIth century. The state-church was at its lowest ebb of inertia and inadequacy; the crowds who flocked to the Rev. John Wesley were again simple and ignorant folk, starved of religion. They could see that what he offered them was better religion than they got (or did not get) from their official pastors; naturally they could not know that something better still, the religion of Christ as Christ gave it, was to be had in the neighborhood of sundry old manor-houses in the country and at mysterious meeting-houses in the towns. Of all the "ifs" of English history, few are more arresting than "if Wesley had been a Catholic, what then?"

These considerations are prompted by the examination of a little M.S. book that recently came into my hands: a ragged small quarto, bound in vellum, and inscribed *A Register Book for the use of the Baptized Church of Christ meeting at Chapel y Ffin;* it is dated 1794 but it also contains "writings and agreements copyd. out of the old decayd Register Book" from 1737. Capel-y-ffin (which takes its name, "the chapel at the boundary," not from the meeting-house hereafter referred to, but from an ancient chapel-of-ease of the parish-church of Llani-

gon) is a scattered hamlet in the south-eastern corner of Breconshire, where the counties of Brecon, Monmouth and Hereford meet, lying along the northern part of the next to the most easterly of the four valleys which run up into the Black Mountains, the vale of Ewyas. It is still a secluded place, where the road ceases to become really practicable for XXth century vehicles and the nearest convenient railway station is ten miles off, at Llanvihangel Crucorney where, in 1678, another "dissenter," the Ven. David Lewis *(alias* Charles Baker, S.J.) was brought before the magistrate. But in the years covered by the register-book the place was even more retired and suitable for an association of a sect still hardly immune from persecution. Even in the earlier years of the XIXth century the normal ways in and out of the valley were by the mountain bridle-paths to Hay at the north and to Longtown on the east; the southern end was not opened up as it is to-day, and Archdeacon Coxe in his *Tour through Monmouthshire* (1801), gives a most alarming account of his adventures in a chaise when penetrating the vale of Ewyas from Abergavenny. In the register it is noted (15th Septr. 1805) that "Abergavenny is far from here and none from here goes there but seldom," and that letters should be directed "to the care of Mr. Swetman Shopkeeper Hay Breconshire."

The easternmost valley of the Black Mountains, adjoining Ewyas, is that of Olchon, and at its southern end, in more or less open country, is Oldcastle, the home of Sir John Oldcastle, sometimes called Lord Cobham, the leader of the Lollards during the reign of Henry V. After his escape from the Tower and the abortive rising of 1414 he fled to the west and was in hiding in the vale of Olchon for three years, from whence he organised the disturbances which eventually lead up to his re-capture and hanging in 1417. The diocese of Hereford, in which Olchon and Oldcastle were situated, was one of the centers of Lollardy and without doubt Sir John's enormous influence (he was a man of personality and ability as well as of position and wealth) extended the short distance over the mountain ridge to the then Welsh-speaking inhabitants of Ewyas. Indeed, in spite of the language objection, it is possible that *Bwlch Efengyl* (Gospel Pass),

which opens the northern end of Ewyas, gets its name from Lollard preachers. Popular tradition associates it with the presence of St. Paul, while some writers have brought Abp. Baldwin through here when on his crusading mission; the second conjecture is as certainly wrong as the first, for Giraldus, who was with the archbishop, definitely says that they went from "Landeu" to Abergavenny *via* Coed Grono, i. e. Grwynefawr, the next valley west.

A little more than two hundred years later, in 1633, there was formed in the vale of Olchon a Church of Particular Baptists under the pastorate of one Howell Vaughan; though politically in Herefordshire, it was accounted the second non-conformist church to be founded in Wales and the first of that persuasion.[1]

From very early days the Olchon Baptists had a "branch" at Capel-y-ffin, and the two places were closely associated. There was never a distinct meeting-house at Olchon, worship being conducted in private houses, and so when, in 1762, an acre of ground was given in Capel-y-ffin and a meeting-house built thereon, the Olchon "church" became merged in and lost its name to Capel-y-ffin.

It is thus seen that this tiny Welsh hamlet has a tradition of religious "dissent" going back to the days of Henry V. Whether that tradition is unbroken is not clear, but the Baptists of the neighborhood are conscious and proud of the antiquity of their association, and always date it to the XVth century.[2] It is possible that there is here a tenuous link between pre-reformation dissenters and post-reformation protestants—but no sufficient continuity to make Wiclif or Oldcastle, much less Langland or Fr. John Ball, "morning-stars of the Reformation!"

---

1 The Baptists, who were first organized in the beginning of the XVIIth century, were divided into Arminian or General Baptists, whose theology was Arian and who held the doctrine of "universal redemption" and Independent Calvinistic or Particular Baptists, who held the doctrine of "particular redemption." In England they definitely renounced infant baptism about 1638 and soon after became immersionists. The Particular Baptists numbered only 5,000 in 1750; this was increased to 30,000 by 1801, owing to the fervour of Wesley and Whitfield; and an aggressive evangelism overcoming their Calvinism, they had risen to 120,000 in 1832. John Bunyan was their most noteworthy adherent.

2 They even claim that Sir John Oldcastle was "re-baptised" in Olchon brook, but there is no evidence beyond vague tradition.

The register-book of this ancient association was kept in no ways methodically or completely. It includes lists of members, baptisms (by immersion in the Afon Honddhu and other streams), amounts and details of collections, disciplinary records, and notices of pastors, who until recently merely added the duties of the ministry to their work as farmers. No marriages are recorded (this was the business of the parish-church) nor deaths, except incidentally. Throughout its pages, from 1737, the same family names continually appear, many of which, Watkins, Lewis and Price, for example, are with us still.

From the entry of a Church Meeting on June 2nd, 1784, it seems likely that the complete fusion of Olchon with Capel-y-ffin did not take place until that date. The agreement is a good example of the decency and simplicity which characterised their religion. It begins as follows:

> We agree to make our covenant as a church with each other, in the name, and in the fear of the Lord and in His strength, that is to say as followeth. First if a Brother or Sister shall be found guilty of giving a private offence to a fellow-member, that such offended member is to behave to the offender according to the rule given in St. Matt. in Chap. 18, 15.16.17. Secondly, not to forget or forsake the Assembling of ourselves together, on our publick, and more private prayer meetings, but in love and after, instruct, sympathise, comfort, bear each others burden, And pray with and for one another, Heb. 10.25. *Et cetera, et cetera.*

Baptism being denied to infants, christening was replaced by a naming ceremony; e.g.:

> William and Daniel and Mary and Sarah. The two sons and two daughters of Wm. Jones by Sarah his wife were named (as above) before many witnesses 6th. of January 1812.
>
> John the son of John Nichols by Blanche Williams his intended wife was Named before witnesses. Feb. 19, 1913.

With reference to this last entry, it should be borne in mind that the country people of Great Britain have never regarded

the parenthood of *betrothed* persons with excessive disfavour. So that when, in the XIIIth century, the clergy, as against the baronage, urged that English law should recognize the legitimation of children by the subsequent marriage of their parents, they voiced public opinion as well as canon law.

There are two moving obituary notices, expressed in familiar terms:

> Joan Ellis Died August 24th, 1843. . . . She had the high privilege of Living consistent with her profession. . . . She was a very eminent Christian, faithful and zealous with the cause, and in her last affliction she exemplified all Christian graces in great perfection—often she said . . . "pray for me that I may be kept from murmuring."
>
> Thomas Prosser of Cwmbwch died Febry. 2nd. 1848. . . . He (under)went two great afflictions, he bore them with great patience, and resignation to the will of God.

A good proportion of the register is taken up with particulars of the exercise of the discipline of "exclusion," i.e. excommunication, which in any given case was resolved on in private and executed in public meeting.

> For what offences or crimes People ought to be excluded from communion (i.e. with the church).
>
> 1. Such who are disturbers of the Church's peace. 1 Cor. 11.16. Gal. 5.12.
>
> 2. Such who do not keep their places in the Church. Jude 6. verse 19.
>
> 3. Such who walk disorderly and irregular in their lives. 2. Thess. 3.6.11.14.
>
> 4. All such as commit atrocious crimes unrepented of and continued in with such we are bid not to eat at the Lord's Table. 1 Cor. 5.11.
>
> 5. All yt are erroneous who hold and propagate doctrine, Rom. 16.17. John 9.10.11.
>
> The end of excluding persons from a Church ought to be the glory of God in the 1st place.

2. to purge the church and preserve it from infection a little leven levens the whole lump 1 Cor. 5,7,13,

3. the good of persons excommunicated Jude vers. 23, 2 Thess 3.14. 2 Cor. 2.7.

Sound doctrine here! The following are examples of its application:

Chapel y ffin May 4th. 1793. Then agreed that James Williams to be excluded for drunkenness and other crimes laid to his Charge. Anne his wife to be suspended for false speaking with other things unbecoming the Gospel. And Mary Burton for injuring her fellow member & other crimes. To be done at the Lord's Table. Which was performed the Sabbath following. (Four signatures.)

ffoddog (a neighboring hamlet) 22 Novr. 1794. Then agreed at our Church Meeting to exclude Joseph Lewis from our communion for neglecting his place at our prayer meetings and breaking his church covenant and disobeying our Xtian exhortations and willingly injuring William Price one of his fellow members, on the next monthly day at Chapel y ffin. Witness our hands. (Six signatures.)

23rd. May 1801. Then agreed for Wm. Edwards, Margaret Price, Jas Lewis and his wife, and James Price to come to the prayer meeting (at our meeting house) at & upon the Day which the Ministers and Messengers at the next Annual Meeting shall appoint for prayer & C[3] in the Churches and our Bro. Geo. Watkins to send a Letter to acquaint ye sd. Price of the necessity of his coming as he lives not near to be otherwise informed. And if they or any of them shall willingly neglect to comply to exclude such from communion upon the ordinance day next following for breaking the covenant with God and their brethren with other errors if they shall not be restored sooner.

3 From elsewhere in the register I find that "& C" included *fasting*.

James Lewis & his wife attended & gave satisfaction to the Brethren.

Witness our hands 27th. May 1801. (five signatures.)

That faith was regarded as well as morals the following entry emphasises:

Feb. 27. 1808. Then agreed to exclude James Price from communion with the church for holding and propagating eroneous Doctrines, such as the winchesterian & C and profligate life to be done at our next ordinance day which was performed after the Lord's Supper was administered at the Table on ye 27th. of March 1803. As witness our hands. John Griffiths. John Lewis. William Price. James Lewis.

The Winchesterian doctrine was so called from a Baptist minister of Philadelphia, U. S. A., one Elhanan Winchester, who held Universalist views which he promulgated in London between 1787 and 1794; after his return to the States, they were taken up and pushed by his biographer, William Vidler. His teaching was popularized in South Wales by James Relly, of "Ridllangiregg near Nasboth" (probably Narberth, in Pembrokeshire), and it appears to be now familiarly known as "the Larger Hope."

"Back-sliding" was duly noted. Thus,

Sarah Perrot was Baptised Decr. 5th. 1802. She was excluded March 25th. 1804 for illegal pregnancy after previous warning.

Evan Evans of the Cwm was baptized September the 1st. 1822. He was excluded he being guilty of fornication June the 20, 1824.

Under date Augt. 17th., 1800, the names of fifty-two members are recorded, of whom four, three women and a man, were subsequently excluded. A note is added that,

There is seventeen of the above named . . . either too far off and can't attend, or neglygent and do not, all of them poor except Jane Gilbert who is prevented as she says by her husband.

"Exclusion" is still practiced among the Baptists, but it is no longer made a public matter and is only resorted to in extreme cases of ill living. Doctrinal disruption has been at work and "we consider inconsistency of life the chiefest heresy."

The extracts which follow are from a letter dated Septr. 15th., 1805, and superscribed:

> The Church of Christ meeting at Olchon in Herefordshire and Chapel y ffin in Breconshire to the Church of Christ meeting at Broadmead Bristol sendeth salutation. Honored Brethren
>
> Whereas our dear sister Ann Williams is (in providence) come of late to reside in Bristol and applyd to Dr. Ryland for being received a member with and among you, and as the Revd. Dr. sent a letter to our Minister G. W. signifying his desire to be informed of her good character. . . . She in her youth submitted to the ordinance of Baptism & gave herself a member with us much against and contrary to ye consent & will of her parents with other relations according to the flesh . . . (She) was as useful as could be wished according to her power, and beyond her power we judge that she was willing as she delighted to entertain strangers; which she continued to do for a number of years. Untill the wheel of providence turned unexpectedly against her and her late husband (we hope he arrived safe above) which obligd them both to quit the place and we as a church so low that we could not extricate them out of any part of their distresses. So she Naomi-like went from the poor neighbourhood . . . partly as we are given to think, by poverty, weakness, old age, & perhaps by stubbornness and abatement in her first love. But be that as it may we feel for her . . . So our desire is that you would please to receive her in the Lord watching over her & performing all Christian duties towards her as becometh Christians to their fellow members so we commit you and her to the Lord and to the word of his grace which is able to build you and her and us, in the most holy faith. That the God of peace may sanctify

James Lewis & his wife attended & gave satisfaction to the Brethren.

Witness our hands 27th. May 1801. (five signatures.)

That faith was regarded as well as morals the following entry emphasises:

Feb. 27. 1808. Then agreed to exclude James Price from communion with the church for holding and propagating eroneous Doctrines, such as the winchesterian & C and profligate life to be done at our next ordinance day which was performed after the Lord's Supper was administered at the Table on ye 27th. of March 1803. As witness our hands. John Griffiths. John Lewis. William Price. James Lewis.

The Winchesterian doctrine was so called from a Baptist minister of Philadelphia, U. S. A., one Elhanan Winchester, who held Universalist views which he promulgated in London between 1787 and 1794; after his return to the States, they were taken up and pushed by his biographer, William Vidler. His teaching was popularized in South Wales by James Relly, of "Ridllangiregg near Nasboth" (probably Narberth, in Pembrokeshire), and it appears to be now familiarly known as "the Larger Hope."

"Back-sliding" was duly noted. Thus,

Sarah Perrot was Baptised Decr. 5th. 1802. She was excluded March 25th. 1804 for illegal pregnancy after previous warning.

Evan Evans of the Cwm was baptized September the 1st. 1822. He was excluded he being guilty of fornication June the 20, 1824.

Under date Augt. 17th., 1800, the names of fifty-two members are recorded, of whom four, three women and a man, were subsequently excluded. A note is added that,

There is seventeen of the above named . . . either too far off and can't attend, or neglygent and do not, all of them poor except Jane Gilbert who is prevented as she says by her husband.

"Exclusion" is still practiced among the Baptists, but it is no longer made a public matter and is only resorted to in extreme cases of ill living. Doctrinal disruption has been at work and "we consider inconsistency of life the chiefest heresy."

The extracts which follow are from a letter dated Septr. 15th., 1805, and superscribed:

> The Church of Christ meeting at Olchon in Herefordshire and Chapel y ffin in Breconshire to the Church of Christ meeting at Broadmead Bristol sendeth salutation. Honored Brethren
>
> Whereas our dear sister Ann Williams is (in providence) come of late to reside in Bristol and applyd to Dr. Ryland for being received a member with and among you, and as the Revd. Dr. sent a letter to our Minister G. W. signifying his desire to be informed of her good character. . . . She in her youth submitted to the ordinance of Baptism & gave herself a member with us much against and contrary to ye consent & will of her parents with other relations according to the flesh . . . (She) was as useful as could be wished according to her power, and beyond her power we judge that she was willing as she delighted to entertain strangers; which she continued to do for a number of years. Untill the wheel of providence turned unexpectedly against her and her late husband (we hope he arrived safe above) which obligd them both to quit the place and we as a church so low that we could not extricate them out of any part of their distresses. So she Naomi-like went from the poor neighbourhood . . . partly as we are given to think, by poverty, weakness, old age, & perhaps by stubbornness and abatement in her first love. But be that as it may we feel for her . . . So our desire is that you would please to receive her in the Lord watching over her & performing all Christian duties towards her as becometh Christians to their fellow members so we commit you and her to the Lord and to the word of his grace which is able to build you and her and us, in the most holy faith. That the God of peace may sanctify

you and us wholly and that your and our spirits souls and bodies may be preserved blameless unto the coming of Lord Jesus Christ is & shall be the prayer of

Your unworthy poor brethren, & C.

The minister G. W. referred to is George Watkins, who speaks thus of himself:

> And unworthy me was favoured to begin to engage in the pleasing tho' arduous work (of the ministry) in the year 1765. . . . And having obtained help of God I continue to this day. . . . I have no desire to live any longer than my Master would make me of some use to my fellow-men & fellow Xtians that Jesus X may be more and more glorified in the salvation of the objects of his eternal love. So be it. Geo. Watkins. June 6, 1806.

On the inside of the back cover is an anxious note on Lord Sidmouth's bill (1811) to restrain laymen ("Blacksmiths, Chimneysweepers, Pig-drovers, Pedlars, Coblers") from preaching. "The bill is thrown out."

Throughout the book the handwritings are notably literate, the spelling not often "eroneous," and the facts well expressed. There are no entries in Welsh, except the transcription of a hymn. Occasionally I came across examples of the more fervid style of evangelical diction, for example:

> Our brethren enjoyed great liberty in speaking and the Doctrine was dropping like rain. (1838).
>
> When the net was drawn up, we found that some had been caught, and drawn (we hope) from their old element to breathe in the air of Calvary. (1842).

In reading these records of a despised sect of one hundred and two hundred years ago, there was brought vividly to my mind, on the one hand, the early days of the Church, and on the other, her penal days in England. The simplicity, the faithfulness, the stern discipline, the unworldliness, the trust in God and his grace, whatever the world might do or say, are reflected clearly in the records of these folk whose salvation lay, not in

adult baptism and in ordinances, but in their transparent good faith. And their descendants of to-day are not unworthy of them. Their religion may not be a great force in their lives, but it is a great reality; they hold it simply, firmly and almost without a thought of any other; and the newspaper has not yet supplanted the Sunday sermon, which is appraised and appreciated as an art-connoisseur his treasures. The comparison is deliberate, for preaching is here still a popular art of which all know the rules and the criteria.

There are plenty of such worthy people in all parts of Great Britain, awaiting the onslaught of the Catholic missioner. His will be a hard task, but a harvest of great price will be his reward.

It is perhaps worth adding that Catholic memories still linger: the anniversary service for one deceased is called his "month's mind," and it is not unknown in a thunderstorm for people to retire to a corner of the room and, kneeling, repeat the word *"Oremus"* many times. Last year, on the feast of our Lady's Assumption, the descendants of George Watkins and John Lewis and William Price and of yet older Watkinses, Lewises, Prices and others assembled, by special invitation, to join in Catholic worship for the first time since the Reformation. They listened with patience and *appreciation* to a sermon on our Lady, praised the officiant's "extempore prayer" (the Prayer for Wales!), and saw their Lord and Savior Jesus Christ lifted up to bless them.

DONALD ATTWATER.
Capel-y-ffin, Wales.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE*

With the main thesis of *Christianity and the State*, that "there can be no lasting political good that does not proceed from principles which express the Divine in Society," as also with the admission that "the secular state for which the Reformation was largely responsible is at a low ebb in ethics (p. 322) one may readily agree. But there appears a seeming lack of sincerity as well as of sound logic in a work which, while crediting Luther and Calvin with being "the two religious progenitors of the modern state," (p. 131) fails to accord them their due responsibility for "the desolation of godless nationalism," especially when in another passage of the work, in the process of glorifying political nationalism, we are told that "the Renaissance, the Reformation, the various translations of the Bible, Luther's virile personality, and Calvin's formidable intellectualism were the chief formative factors of modern nationalism" (p. 296).

In a work emanating from the pen of one of America's foremost Protestant spokesmen, one naturally is sorely disappointed at finding oft-refuted innuendoes against the Catholic Church repeated or implied by the author contrary to overwhelming evidence furnished by eminent English and American non-Catholic scholars attesting to the profound, humane and scholarly influence exercised by the pre-Reformation Church and Catholic ecclesiastics in the fields of economics, social relations, and particularly in the development of legal and political institutions, not to speak of art, architecture, literature, science, philosophy, religion. We are not a little surprised at the implication contained in the statement which credits Calvin with having "won before his death the great fight for the intellectualism which saves faith from superstition" (p. 120).

The surprise is all the greater because of the fact that Dr. Cadman himself testifies in the preceding chapter to the cultural and educational efforts of the pre-Reformation Church: "The Universities, headed by Paris were centres of eager culture,

---

**Christianity and the State.* By S. PARKES CADMAN, L. L. D., D. D. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. x+370.

and the 'schools' of the nations gave full stature to the Universities. Besides Paris, there were those of Oxford, Orleans, Toulouse, Montpelier, Cordova, Seville, Toledo, and Bologna. Great cathedrals arose which still reveal to us more religion, more humanity, more individual and collective aspiration than the reading of many books about the century" (p. 105). Hastings Rashdall (*The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*), to whom Dr. Cadman refers, demonstrates the far-reaching efforts of the Church to elevate socially and intellectually the masses of the people. The extent to which she succeeded in dispelling superstition and instilling the ennobling spirit of Christian culture in the masses of peoples lately redeemed from barbarism is implied in a work just fresh from the press, *The Meaning of a Liberal Education,* by Everett Dean Martin, in which it is stated: "At no time since the thirteenth century has the desire for knowledge so nearly approached a mass movement as to-day. We are in the midst of a twentieth century revival of learning." The distinguished Danish philosopher, Harold Hoffding, has justly written: "The Middle Ages has rendered important contributions to intellectual development, and was by no means the wilderness or the world of darkness which it is so often depicted as being. It deepened intellectual life, and sharpened and exercised its powers in no inconsiderable degree, and it certainly yields to no other period in the energy with which it used the means of culture which lay at its disposal limited as these were by the historical circumstances of the time. In later and more favored periods, commanding a rich wealth of content, we shall look in vain for as great a power in elaborating and closely appropriating these riches, as was dedicated by the Middle Ages to its scanty material. . . . Thought developed a formal acuteness, a skill in drawing distinctions and building up arguments which is altogether without parallel" (*History of Modern Philosophy,* Vol. I, pp. 4, 5).

In the preface to the first volume of his *Histoire des Institutions Politiques de la France,* M. Paul Viollet writes, "We issue from the Middle Ages. . . . The roots of modern society lie deep in them. . . . what we are we are in a large measure because of the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages live in us, they are all around us." Our indebtedness is again stressed in the pref-

ace to the second volume where he states, "whatever is most enduring in National character is inherited," a fact which an American scholas Henry Chas. Lea emphasizes, stating that "the history of manhood may be vainly searched for another institution — such as that of the Latin Church, which has exercised so vast an influence on human destinies." *Confession and Indulgence,* I, preface. For as Dr. J. W. Thompson adds: "Aside from being the repository of ancient culture and the transmitter of literature and the learning of antiquity, the Church of the Middle Ages was the teacher of Europe and the mother of arts." *(Reference Studies in Medieval History,* Vol. I, Introduction, p. xxii.). "The intellectual and spiritual awakening between 1100 and 1300 makes these two centuries one of the noblest periods in the history of the progress of the human spirit. The thirteenth century has been compared to that of Greece in the time of Pericles. It is the peer of any age, and, in some particulars, the greatest age in the history of the race. The mere list of the great achievements of the thirteenth century sounds like a roll of guns. The names of the men and women who lived in it, the memory of whom shall not perish from off the earth, forms a shining nebula." (*Op. cit.,* p. xviii.)

In view of this unexcelled intellectual activity of the Middle Ages and because of which, as Dr. Thompson states, "the science, the art, the literature, and the economic and social life of the past are being studied as never before" and for which the church was mainly responsible, the student is naturally puzzled to know just how it can be maintained by Dr. Cadman that "the Protestant Reformation effected the liberation of the human spirit from the thraldom of the Clergy," or how "the Reformation liberated the human conscience and set men free to act according to their own inward promptings and convictions" (p. 119). When it is also stated that, "The Holy See no longer openly pronounced against the State as of diabolic origin, but it plotted against and disparaged its claims," one feels justified in retorting in Dr. Cadman's own words that this is "but [to] pamper a prejudice incapable of correct historic estimates."

Well does Professor Thompson utter the warning that, "in order to understand the history of the Middle Ages it is essential

that the student free his mind from present-day conceptions and prejudiced interpretation—that he put himself as far as possible, by the exercise of historical imagination into the time and the place of the events about which he is reading." He furthermore adds that "perhaps there is no body of human knowledge that has been more overlaid with falsehood, more distorted from the truth, more perverted by sentiment, or more wrenched by prejudice than medieval history, and none about which more credulous and erroneous beliefs obtain. In spite of the labors of accomplished scholars for nearly a century since the rise of the critical historical method each succeeding generation perpetuates the errors of its predecessor. Every teacher of history knows how persistent and broadcast is the spread of false historical ideas" (*Op. cit.*, p. xv).

"The debt of the world to medieval scientific research is not a small one, we owe to the Cloister scholars of that time our modern system of notation and algebra, the compass, the magnifying glass, gun powder, printing, the art of distillation, every acid and alkali not already naturally occurring in nature, the windmill, linen paper, the organ, sugar, many of our medicines. One of the paradoxes to-day is the ignorance of even men of science of what they owe to medieval and renaissance scientific scholarship. The continuity can easily be proved. Germany excelled in mathematical studies in the Middle Ages. The line begins with Albertus Magnus, and runs through John of Saxony, Conrad of Meginburg, Regiomontanus, and George Purbach to Copernicus without a break. Columbus when he discovered America, Vasco da Gama when he rounded the Cape of Good Hope, Magellan when he penetrated the straits which bear his name and circumnavigated the globe for the first time — all these carried Regiomontanus' astronomical tables in their chart houses. Who will say that the modern age does not owe much to medieval science?" (*Op. cit.*, p. xxiv).

Certainly the statements of Dr. Cadman quoted above and the implications contained therein fail to accord with the established facts of History. Our indebtedness in America to the glorious heritage of the Middle Ages is too real and vast to be ignored. Our Common Law heritage, the backbone of our legal system, brings us back to the very heart of the Middle Ages.

And as stated in Pollock and Maitland, "It is by 'popish clergymen' that our common law is converted from the rude mass of customs into an articulate system and when the 'popish clergymen' yielding at length to the Pope's commands, no longer sit as the principal justices of the King's courts the golden age of the Common Law is over" (*History of English Law*, Vol. I, p. 112).

When one remembers the many hostile forces that the civilizing agencies of the church had to contend one must, unless blinded by prejudice, admit his amazement at the magnitude of the achievements of this period. Dr. Jessopp, in *Before the Great Pillage* in which are described the social conditions of England prior to the devastations which marked the birth of English Protestantism, says, "that all that was joyous and gay in their lives, all that was beautiful and ennobling, all that was happy in their recollections, all that was blest in what they imagined, all that was elevating in their dreams, their hopes and their aspirations—all came to them from the influence which their churches exercised upon them." In contrast with the degenerating influence of feudalism he adds, "If it had not been for the other side of the picture—for the blessed relief and the utter change in their surroundings which the churches afforded to the villagers of the fourteenth century. The people must have infallibly have become more brutal, stupid, sodden, and cruel with every successive generation. . . . . All the tendency of the feudal system, working through the machinery of the courts was to keep the people down. All the tendency of the parochial system, working through the parish council holding its assemblies in the churches, where the people met on equal terms as children and servants of the living God and members of one body in Christ Jesus was to lift the people up" (pp. 21, 23). He furthermore points out that "our churches were the great strongholds of the sentiment of liberty and the great reminders to the people of their rights as freemen" (p. 26).

Even Dr. Cadman himself, is constrained to accept the conclusions of scholars as to the far-reaching intellectual activities and social progress of the pre-Reformation Church. In a chapter entitled, *The Growth and Purpose of the State* in which are portrayed at some length the struggles of the church against anarchy, feudalism, royal autocracy, and other demor-

alizing forces, and which is perhaps the best part of the work, he writes: "Between the years 1100 and 1500, the State gradually attained stability and power. Its vested interests and social efficiency increased apace. Religious and political progress was unhindered by the chaos that had ensued after the ruin of the Roman and Frankish Empires. It has been suggested that this was the constitutional period of English speaking nations, and that the parliamentarians of the seventeenth century who reduced the royal prerogative were reclaiming their former rights rather than asserting new ones! . . . . . .

"Then and there Christian Europe began to exhibit those saving merits which it has since in part retained and which enabled it to colonize America and transmit civilizing forces to Asiatic and African lands. The political doctrines of the English State, which have preserved their identity through all successive changes, were for the first time clearly ascertained and stated. 'There first appeared with distinctness that constitution of which all other free constitutions in the world are copies, and which, in spite of some defects, deserves to be regarded as the best under which any great society has ever yet existed during many ages. Then it was that the House of Commons, the archtype of all the representative assemblies which now meet, either in the Old or in the New World, held its first sittings. Then it was that the common law rose to the dignity of a science and rapidly became a not unworthy rival of the imperial judisprudence. . . . Then it was that the most ancient colleges, which still exist at both the great seats of learning, were founded. Then was formed that language less musical, indeed, than the language of the South but in force, in richness, in aptitude for all the highest purposes of the poet, the philosopher and the orator, inferior to the tongue of Greece alone. Then, too, appeared the first dawn of that noble literature the most splendid and the most durable of the many glories of England.' (Macaulay, *History of England,* Everyman's Library Ed., Vol. I, p. 21). . . . . *At the root of the matter as touching law and the constitution, those changes were made at that time which left future ages little to do, but to improve in their details. The political and social institutions of England, France and Germany gradually assumed those forms that char-*

acterized European and American nations today" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 103, 106, 107).

No attempt will be made by the writer to reconcile this evaluation of the part played by Catholicism in the development of the State and modern political institutions with the statement made by Dr. Cadman in the succeeding Chapter in which he attributes the genesis of the modern state to the Renaissance and Protestantism. In the chapter entitled *"The Modern State,"* we are told that, "the less fastidious Luther and the more logical Calvin outdid the sons of the Renaissance in the making of the modern state. . . . . Yet one name must be mentioned at some length since it suggests all that was at once most formidable and victorious in Protestantism as the parent of the modern state. . . . . Throughout the negotiations and the battlings which resulted in the genesis of the modern state one perceives the courage, the strategy, the psychic force of the Genevan giant . . . . . From his brain sprang the germinal ideas that were afterwards developed in the political character of the leading nations of the West" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 119, 124, 126).

Even Dr. Cadman, is constrained to admit that "Calvinism however, while democratic in theory and as such the progenitor of much modern democracy was aristocratic in practice." He might more truly have charged that Calvin far from being democratic was autocratic in both theory and practice. In his *Institutes of Christian Religion*, published in 1536, which Dr. Cadman terms "the first text-book of Protestant Theology," Calvin insists in an elaborate exposition on the duty of passive obedience to existing rulers. Concerning the duties of subjects he writes: "Even if an individual of the worst character, one most unworthy of all honor, if invested with public authority receives that illustrious divine power which the Lord has by His word devolved on the minister of His justice and judgment; and accordingly. . . . . in so far as public obedience is concerned, he is to be held in the same honor and reverence as the best of kings.

"We will never entertain the seditious thought that a king is to be treated according to his deserts and that we are not bound to act the part of good subjects to him who does not in turn act the part of a king to us" (Book IV, Chap. XX).

One searches in vain for an echo of American democratic political theory in the foregoing passage of Calvin's writings. Speaking of the "diametrically opposite tendencies" promoted by the teachings of the Reformers "in Lutheran and Calvinistic lands," the late Dr. Dunning in his *History of Political Theories, Ancient and Medieval,* states: "In the former which were mostly monarchic it confirmed the practice of passive submission. . . . . . . In the latter, where aristocratic institutions commonly prevailed the effect of the conception was to justify the utmost extension of political authority. . . . Thus in monarchic lands the tendency of the Reformation was to enhance the hold of the monarchic principle, and in aristocratic governments to confirm, the principle of aristocracy. In both the effect was to strengthen absolutism in the political sovereign" (Vol. II, pp. 35, 36).

Little justification can then be found in Calvin's writings or Calvinism for the theory of the Calvinistic origin of democracy. Lord Acton in his *History of Freedom* agrees with Dr. Dunning in maintaining that, "the progress of the consitution which was the work of the Catholic ages to build up was interrupted by the attractions which the growth of absolutism exited, and by the Reformation's transferring the ecclesiastical power to the crown" (p. 208). Nor was the Reformer's opposition to the democratic theory of the State left to pass unchallenged. Early in the 17th century as Dr. Dunning writes, Cardinal "Bellarmine makes a rather vigorous attack on Calvin for the preference given to autocracy" (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 129). About the same time the eminent Spanish moralist and jurist Suarez, now recognized by scholars as one of the chief founders of the Science of International Law, maintained with vigor what he rightly claimed to be the traditional theory of the pre-Reformation moralists and jurists that, "the only depository of the supreme power that has a basis in natural right, is the whole community and not any individual whatever" (*op. cit.*, p. 143). It is "to the labors of the opponents of the Divine Right," among whom Bellarmine and Suarez were the foremost exponents, that "we owe it," says another non-Catholic writer, Dr. Figgis, "that liberty of thought has become a recognized principle of modern life." (*Divine Right of Kings*, p. 216). Very few, even non-Catholic scholars, will agree with the reference to

Catholic teaching contained in the statement of Dr. Cadman that, "the divine right of kings, taught for centuries in nearly every Protestant and Roman Catholic school, was the curse of freedom till it finally wore itself out" (*Op. cit.*, p. 336).

That "popular sovereignity is the traditional political theory of Catholic philosophy" has been ably demonstrated by O'Rahilly (cf. *Studies* March, 1921.) who personally examined the works of "all the principal Catholic writers of the period" from the beginning of the thirteenth century down to the time of Bellarmine and Suarez as well as of the preceding and succeeding centuries. From his extended studies of the problem he concludes that, "the scholastic democratic theory was held by practically all Catholic philosophers and theologians for six centuries," the period extending from the 13th to the 19th century. His thesis is sustained by the non-Catholic scholar Dr. Sidwick: "In the later Middle Ages, from the thirteenth century onward, it is the most accepted doctrine, that secular government rests on the consent of the people who have an original right to chose their own form of government" (*Development of European Polity*, p. 322). This is also the conviction of Dr. A. J. Carlyle, who states: "There is really no doubt whatever that in the normal tradition of the Middle Ages the position of the ruler was conceived as that of one who ruled with the advice and consent of the chief powers of the community. . . . The authority of the medieval ruler rested on the consent of the community" (*History of Medieval Political Theory*, Vol. III, p. 154).

Filmer's *Patriarcha*, written in defense of the Divine Right theory and in refutation of the Catholic democratic tenet, which was, as he contends, "first hatched in the schools and hath been fostered by all succeeding Papists for good divinity," (Chap. I) as well as the anti-Bellarmine chairs established in Oxford and Cambridge in defence of the divine right theory strongly assailed by Catholic moralists, constitute unimpeachable testimony against Dr. Cadman's charge that the "divine right of kings" was taught for centuries in nearly every Roman Catholic school.

The writer agrees with Dr. Cadman when he states that, "it is men's degraded conception of that Father's nature and purposes which have implanted its more deplorable evils upon society."

He might also truthfully have added that in the development of this "degraded conception," Luther, Calvin and traditional Protestantism have played a not inconspicuous rôle.

A ring of honesty as well as of harmonic resonance with the findings of modern scholarship is evidenced in the following frank admission of Dr. Harry E. Fosdick, contained in a sermon delivered in the Cathedral at Geneva, at the League of Nations Assembly Service, September 13, 1925, in which the inherent, anti-social destructive character of Nationalism, admittedly the fruit of Protestantism, is portrayed; "But within the last four hundred years Nationalism has taken a new and startling form in our western world. With the England of Elizabeth, the France of Louis XI, the Russia of Peter the Great, the development began which more and more has nationalized both the inner and the outer life of all of us. Our politics have become nationalized until the aggrandizement of one's own country in the competitive struggle with other nationalities has been the supreme aim of statesmanship. Our economic life has become nationalized. . . . . Our education has become nationalized; our children have been taught from infancy history all out of perspective, with national egoism for its organizing center and with hatred of other nations masquerading as patriotic training of the young. Even our religion has been nationalized; with State churches or without them, the center of loyalty in the religious life of the people has increasingly become the nation. Let Protestantism acknowledge its large responsibility for this in Western Christendom! In our fight for liberty we broke up the inclusive mother church into national churches; we reorganized the worship of the people around nationalistic ideals; we helped to identify religion and patriotism, and so far has that identification gone that now, when war breaks, the one God of all humanity, Whom Christ came to reveal, is split up into little tribal deities, and before these pagan idols, even Christians pray for the blood of their enemies.

"Never before has human life, its statecraft, its economics, its education, its religion, on so large a scale been organized on a nationalistic basis, and the issue is obvious. The supreme object of devotion for multitudes is the nation. In practical action they know no higher God. They really worship Caesar.

That is the limit of loyalty, what was once said of the king is now said of the nation; it can do no wrong. And such sheer paganism is sometimes openly flaunted, at least in my country, and I presume in yours as, 'our country! . . . may she always be in the right, but our country right or wrong' " (*A Christian Conscience About War*, pp. 10, 11).

What Dr. Fosdick recognizes as one of the greatest tragedies of Protestantism, the "breaking up of the inclusive Mother Church into national churches," and the consequent "reorganization of worship around nationalistic ideals," involving as it did the destruction of the churches former potent international moral influence, Dr. Cadman, apparently considers its greatest triumph. "The pivotal fact of the Reformation" (he contends) "was the disengagement of the modern state from the federalizing influence of papacy. This is the verity of verity behind the expansion and freedom of life which is being discussed, the one great gain that must be stressed in any account of the modern State" (*Op. cit.*, p. 123).

Not for a moment will Dr. Cadman tolerate a renewal of Papal moral influence in international affairs even though the mass of evidence constrains him to acknowledge the world's past indebtedness to the Church for promoting international peace, through the exercise of "the right of the Christian Church to summon to a truce of God" a right which, he states, "was splendidly exercised by the medieval Pontiffs." (p. 34.) One is naturally puzzled to understand how the destruction of this beneficient world influence can be conceived by the same writer as "the one great gain" or "the pivotal fact of the Reformation" particularly when he admits, that "if religion is to sway all aspects and departments of human life—social, political, economical, national and international, as surely it ought, its message must be as wide and as various as its claims" such a religion and such an all-prevailing moral influence is surely foreign to a type of Christianity which maintains as its basic truths, that "every Protestant is his own priest" (p. 344), and "Our Lord exponded no stated system of doctrine or organization" (p. 188).

Dr. Cadman even admits the hopelessness of Protestantism as at present disintegrated to secure world peace which he claims

as "the imperative duty of Protestantism." Hence to accomplish this task and that of regenerating the nationalistic state he visions the development of "a Protestant Catholicity, that shall reoccupy ground too long abandoned to a type of Catholicity which they cannot conscientiously accept" (p. 351).

Visions of unity of this kind must indeed afford little consolation and bleak promise to humanity particularly when the history of the origin and development of Protestantism shows, according to Dr. Cadman, that "its founders never agreed about the essential nature of the church, nor has any unanimous agreement been reached since their day" (p. 348).

Must not the world return for safe guidance to the self-same Catholic principles of Gospel teaching which in the ages past, diffusing themselves throughout the laws, institutions and morals of the people, permeating all ranks and relations of civil society, happily united church and state in concord and friendly interchange of good offices. May not these self-same unchangeable principles of Catholic unity be still all potent in regenerating the world and uniting people together as St. Augustine long ago pointed out, "not in society only, but in a sort of brotherhood, citizen with citizen, nation with nation, and the whole race of men by reminding them of their common parentage" (*De Moribus Eccl. Cathol.*, xxx, 63).

DONALD A. MACLEAN,
Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MISCELLANY

THE SACRED TRIBUNAL OF THE ROTA

The Sacred Tribunal of the Rota—SACRA ROTA ROMANA—is one of the most venerable and respected tribunals of the world. Discussing its origin, Hilling says (*Die römische Kurie*): "The earliest known basis of the Roman Rota is found in the famous Constitution of John XXII, *Ratio Juris*, of the year 1331, which prescribed likewise the form of the oath of office for the auditors and notaries of the Rota. While in the fourteenth century the number of auditors appears to have been considerable, it fell in the fifteenth century to about fourteen, and was finally and definitely fixed at twelve by Sixtus IV in the Bull, *Romani Pontificis*, of May, 1472.

"In earliest times the competency of the Rota was not strictly regulated; it rather depended on special commissions by the Pope. Its most important matters were contested benefices and other ecclesiastical civil controversies from within the domain of the universal Church, also all profane civil suits within the Papal States. Only criminal and fiscal matters were excluded from the forum of the Rota. After the Rota had been deprived of the greater part of its jurisdiction *de facto* by the erection of the Roman Congregations, Benedict XIV, in the Constitution, *Justitiae et Pacis*, definitely fixed in the year 1746 the *Causae rotales*, and ordained that in future the court of the Rota could only be appealed to in second or higher instance. By the *Regolamento legislativo e giudiciario*, of Gregory XVI, 1834, the scope of the Rota was once more defined."

The Rota underwent further organization during the pontificate of Pius X, and its present status dates from the issuance of the Constitution, *Sapienti Consilio*, June 29, 1908. The details of the organization are to be found in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. I, pp. 20 ff.

Of the twelve judges constituting the Rota at the present time, eight are Italians, one is Austrian, for the German-speaking peoples; one is Polish, for the Slavs, and one, French. The English seat is vacant since the death of Mgr. Prior, rector of the Beda, who served for many years as dean. His successor, Mgr. Massimi, paid the deceased prelate the following tribute when the officials of the Rota were recently received by Pope Pius XI at the opening of their juridical year:

> It was a sad year of mourning for the Rota on account of the death of its Dean, Msgr. John Prior, which occurred at Darlington, his birthplace.
>
> Special sadness attaches to our remembrance of him at this annual inauguration. We have seen him assist at it on fifteen consecutive occasions, from 1908 to 1922, in which year he had the honour of making this speech before Your Holiness.
>
> That was almost his last official act, for shortly afterwards he was suddenly bowed down under the weight of an affliction which condemned him to three years and a half of painful inactivity, at the end of which he died. "Sanctissime" is the expression used by the local Ordinary in a

message to our Tribunal, and it is easy for us to believe it was so, knowing, as we do, his virtues.

The Rota may well be proud of having had, first as Uditore, and then as Dean, such a model priest, who was upright and pious, intelligent and cultured, courteous but firm, and devoted, with childlike affection to the person of the Roman Pontiff.

His most noted characteristic was his laboriousness, which was calm, constant and tenacious, and which urged him even to the sacrifice of his life. Thus, while we are about to resume our labours, that which was a sad thought becomes an opportune admonishment. We must concentrate on the beautiful example of all virtues left to us by our venerable departed one, and especially on his great love of work. The duties of a court of law are frequently hard and distasteful, whence a tendency to defer them. It is for us all, judges, officials, and advocates, to counteract that tendency with every effort in our power.

The Holy Father, in his reply, said: "We were united with you this morning in prayer. We begged all blessings for you and your work, and we offered suffrages for the soul of your much-lamented Dean, whose sacred memory, so beautiful and so edifying, you have recalled with so much brotherly affection."

The Rota is virtually the Supreme Court of the Catholic Church. Its members are chosen for their erudition, impartiality, experience and grave judicial mind. They are learned in canon and civil law. They weigh, examine and sift all evidence pro and con with the minutest and most scrupulous attention. Hence their findings are as fair and impartial as it is possible for human reason and intellect to compass. Hence, too, the Sacred Tribunal of the Rota enjoys in ecclesiastical affairs a respect and confidence enjoyed only by the greatest courts of the world in civil matters. It is to the Church what the Supreme Court is to the United States, the Privy Council to Britain and Canada and the Court of Cassation to France. Its Dean or presiding officer has not ineptly been described as "the Lord Chief Justice of the Catholic Church."

A recent decision of the Rota has aroused a great deal of interest and incidentally, be it said, evoked much acrimonious discussion by men whose knowledge of the Catholic Church and its venerated tribunals may be equated by an algebraic "x."

SACRA ROMANA ROTA

SOUTHWARCEN

NULLITATIS MATRIMONII (VANDERBILT—DE MARLBOROUGH)

Pio PP. XI feliciter regnante, Pontificatus Dominationis Suae anno quinto, die 29 iulii 1926, RR. PP. DD. Auditores de turno, Henricus Quattrocolo, Ponens, *Franciscus Morano et Aroturus Wynen, in causa* Southwarcen. *Nullitatis Matrimorni, inter* Consuelam Vanderbilt, *actricem, repraesentatam per legitimum procuratorem, Nazarenum Ferrata, advocatum, et* Carolum Ducem de Marlborough,

interveniente et disceptante in causa vinculi Defensore ex officio, sequentem tu lerunt in gradu appellationis definitivam sententiam.

I. Ex americana et ditissima orta familia, sed religione acatholica, Consuela Vanderbilt, baptizata, decimum et septimum annum cum attigisset, deperire coepit virum quemdam, nomine M... R..., cui clam se spopondit. At eius mater, re cognita, filiae vota ovsecundare pervicaciter renuit, imo, ut iam conceptum amorem in filiae corde perimeret, an. 1894 in Europam eam duxit; cumque Consuela puella esset, quae, "apportait jeunesse, beauté et grande fortune ainsi qu'une brillante éducation," eam nuptui viro tradere cogitavit, qui praeclara Angliae nobilitate fulgeret. Et sane Londini ea invenit Carolum Ducem de Marlborough, quem hospitem in sua familia iuxta mare apud *Newport* in Statis Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis invitavit, quo propterea mater et filia reversae deinceps fuere.

Acceptae invitationi morem Carolus gessit, menseque septembri an. 1875 Newport urbem se contulit, ubi per quindecim circiter dies apud familiam Vanderbilt commoratus est. Pridie autem quam proficisceretur condicionem uxoriam Consuelae ipsimet Carolus detulit, quae illico ad matrem confugit; sed perperam: de celebratis enim sponsalibus iam nuncium ephemerides vulgaverant opera matris. Unde factum est ut Canadiensi peragrata regione, die statuta matrimonii adventante, Dux tandem ad Consuelam rediret, quacum nuptias Neoeboraci in protestantica ecclesia contraxit die 6 novembris an. 1895, cum vir etiam acatholicae sectae esset addictus.

Infaustum vero exitum hae nuptiae habuerunt; nam breve post tempus a matrimoniali inito foedere ipsamet uxor marito aperuit nonnisi invitam et a matre coactam se adaras ivisse, seque amore flagrare erga alterum virum. Dissociatis propterea animis, cumque graviter uxorem negligeret Dux, bina prole ex matrimonio consecuta, anno 1905 quoad thorum et cohabitationem primum coniuges se separarunt; anno autem 1920 mutuo consensu civile divortium obtinuerunt, unde ad novas nuptias uterque convolavit; anno tandem 1925 ad nullitatem consequendam sui coniugii cum Carolo initi supplicem libellum mulier porrexit Curiae Southwarcensi, quae, rite confecto processu, die 9 februarii 1926 sententiam tulit de matrimonii nullitate ex capite vis et metus. Ad H. S. O. vinculi loci Defensor provocavit; quare iterum causa disceptanda nunc venit sub consueta formula dubii: "An constet de matrimonii nullitate, in casu."

2. *In iure.*—Res est in casu de metu reverentiali, qui profecto ex constanti canonistarum sententia, ex sanctione Codicis iuris canonici et ex uniformi iurisprudentia Rotali, si, praeter alias conditiones, directus sit ad extorquendum consensum sitque gravis, irritum reddit coniugium. (Gasparri, *De Matr.* n. 942, Wernz, *Ius decr*, IV, n. 264, can. 1087 Cod.; S. R. Rota, in Parisien., 27 iulii 1910; Tarvisina, 11 mart. 1912; Transylvanien., I maii 1912; N. N. coram Lega, 16 maii 1912; Hyderabaden, 2 aug. 1921).

3. *In facto.*—Animadvertendum censuerunt Patres in primis, cum nuptiarum fidem dedisset actrix domino M... R..., quem vehementer amabat, fortiter huic matrimonio obstitisse eius matrem, quae summas vires adhibuit ut animum filiae ab illo averteret viro, nuptiasque cum eodem impediret. Ad rem enim fassa est actrix: "Ma mère me détacha de l'influence de mon prétendant. Elle me fit quitter

mon pays, intercepta toutes les lettres que m'adressait mon prétendant et celles que je lui adressais. Elle faisait de scènes continuelles. Elle disait que je devais obéir; qu'elle savait très bien que je n'avais pas le droit de choisir un mari; que je devais prendre l'homme de son choix; que mon opposition ruinait sa santé et que je pouvais être la cause de sa mort. Il y eut une terrible scène quand elle me dit que si je réussissais à me sauver, elle saisirait la première occasion pour fusiller mon prétendant, qu'elle serait alors mise en prison et pendue et que j'en serais responsable." Quae narratio non solum confirmatur a matre, sed etiam a testibus, quidemque quoad omnia particularia, ita ut de eius veritate dubitari nullatenus debeat.

4. At visum est praeterea Patribus nedum matrem ineluctabiliter ab amato viro filiam suam separasse, sed eam insuper coëgisse ut cum Duce de Marlborough matrimonium iniret. Qua in re, cum allegans metum debeat illum probare non per aliquales dumtaxat probationes, sed per eas quae moralem certitudinem gignant de exsistentia metus, actrix in casu perplurima iudicialiter retulit, quae metum revera demonstrant. Tradidit enim: "...Ayant détruit la possibilité de mon mariage avec celui que j'aimais, ma mère me dit qu'elle avait choisi un homme qu'elle regardait convenable à tous les égards, qu'il allait arriver en Amérique pour demeurer chez elle comme son hôte, qu'elle avait déjà négocié au sujet d'un mariage... Je persiste à déclarer que si j'ai consenti au mariage avec le Duc de Marlborough, ce fut sous la pression très forte de ma mère, et d'après sa volonté absolue. En plus des menaces, dont il est parlé ailleurs, ma mère me dit plusieurs fois que si je persistait à m'opposer à sa volonté, c'était, vu son état de santé, une contrariété telle, qu'elle pouvait amener sa mort. Tel fut aussi l'avis du docteur, lequel me fut connu par une amie de ma mère, Mme Jay, qui le tenait d'elle." —Ei igitur quem puella deperibat alium virum suffecit eius mater, quae cum esset nobilitatis tituli cupidine adlecta, omnique esset Consuela muliebri gratia perfusa divitiisque praepollens, vix Ducem Londini cognovit, eum illico hospitem apud se voluit in urbe Newport, ut filiae in maritum haud utcumque proponeret, sed praecise adsignaret: "Elle disait que je devais obéir, qu'elle savait très bien, que je n'avais pas le droit de choisir un mari; je devais prendre l'homme de son choix."

5. Attamen, etsi testimonium metum passi iuramento firmatum summi momenti adminiculum in iure censeatur ad matrimonii nullitatem arguendam ob incussum metum, quia metuens tantum trepidationem animi experitur et directe cognoscit, ceteri autem nonnisi per indicia, vim tamen probandi non habet, nisi per aliorum testium depositionem et per praesumptiones probe confirmetur. At in themate id plene consequitur sive per testium attestationes, sive per praesumptiones. Nam pars ipsa conventa deposuit se rescivisse a sua uxore post viginti circiter dies ab initis nuptiis hoc matrimonium eam contraxisse quia a matre fuerat adacta: "Elle m'a dit que sa mère avait insisté pour qu'elle se mariât avec moi; que sa mére était ardemment opposée à son mariage avec M. R., et que toute contrainte, poussée presque jusqu'aux violences physiques, avait été employée pour arriver à ces fins."—Consuelae autem mater, quae

metum intulit, fateri et declarare non dubitavit: "J'ai forcé ma fille à épouser le Duc. J'ai toujours eu une influence absolue sur ma fille, mes enfants m'ayant été entièrement confiés après mon divorce: j'avais eu seule leur éducation entre mes mains. Quand je donnais un ordre personne ne discutait. Je ne l'ai donc pas priée, mais commandée de se marier avec le Duc... J'ai alors invité le Duc à venir me faire visite chez moi à Newport. Il vint et il resta environ 14 jours. Alors j'ai dit à ma fille que c'était lui le mari, que j'avais choisi pour elle. Elle en fut toute bouleversée, et elle répondit qu'elle ne pouvait pas l'épouser. Je considérais que j'étais justifiée à passer outre à son opposition comme simplement la niaiserie d'une jeune fille sans expérience."—Actricis pariter amita testata est: "Ce mariage a été imposé par ma sœur à sa fille, qui, je l'ai déjà dit, désirait faire un autre mariage." Domina tandem Lucia Jay, sciscitanti iudici: "Estimez-vous que cette contrainte était simple persuasion, ou plutôt coercition?" sub iuramento affirmavit: "Aucune persuasion tout à fait, mais contrainte absolue, cela je le jure, je le sais."—Porro cum illa haberi debeat probatio plena et perfecta quae fit per duos testes omni exceptione maiores (Reiff., lib. IV, tit. XIX, *de Divortiis*), constare patet in casu de incusso metu; partes enim in causa et adducti testes, ex declaratione Episcopi Southwarcensis, Parisiensis Curiae aliquorumque parochorum omni fide vere praestantes resultant.

Quae conclusio ex alia parte magis magisque roboratur in casu et convincitur per aversionem, qua adversus Ducem ferebatur Consuela; nam circa viri characterem in iurata sua declaratione tradidit actrix: "L'arrogance de son caractère créa enmoi des sentiments d'hostilité. Il avait l'air de mépriser tout ce qui n'était pas anglais, mon orgueil en fut offensé." Huic autem affirmationi quoad indolem Ducis optime cohaeret attestatio ipsius amitae actricis.

6. Minus denique ambigendum esse tenuerunt Patres in casu de metus gravitate. Attento enim quod metus gravis haberi potest absque minis et verberibus, quodque ipsamet parentum indignatio malum profecto est, imo malum grave, si gravis et diuturna futura sit, prouti communiter docent Auctores et diserte tradit Clericatus (*De Matrim.*, dec. 37, n. 24) his verbis: "Metus reverentialis dupliciter consideratur vel cum periculo, vel sine tali periculo. Primo modo quando filius vel filia non obtemperans voluntati patris . . . timet rationabiliter reddere illum sibi infensum, superciliosum, torve aspicientem, nec placide loquentem, et multo magis etc., quae omnia reputantur in filio mala gravia et insupportabilia," rimatis processualibus tabulis, gravitas metus in praesenti evidenter concluditur. Dant enim cuncti testes Carolo puellam nupsisse voluntate victam indomitae matris, unde eiusdem indignationis periculum valde pertimescendum Consuelae erat si impositae nuptiae infectae mansissent; praesertim si consideretur quod coram illa contremiscere pronum ei erat quae, suavis et mitis et obedientiae assueta, matri erat subjecta ex adverso imperiosae, contradictionis experti omniaque flectenti mori suo suaeque effrenatae cupiditati.—Accedit quod nisi Carolo nupsisset grave alterum malum et periculum formidandum erat Consuelae, mors nempe ipsius matris ex ipsamet doctoris sententia, quod frequentissime mater suae filiae minabatur, prouti in suo tertio interrogatorio actrix sic retulit: "En plus de menaces dont il est parlé ailleurs, ma mère me dit plusieurs fois que si je persistais à m'opposer à sa volonté, c'était, vu son état de santé,

une contrariété telle, qu'elle pouvait amener sa mort. Tel fut aussi l'avis du docteur, lequel me fut connu par une amie da ma mère, Mme Jay, qui le tenait d'elle." Quam iuratam assertionem dña Tiffany, actricis amita, confirmavit aiendo: "Ma sœur faisait des scènes continuelles à sa fille, et essayait de l'attendrir en lui disant qu'elle avait une maladie de cœur, et que si elle continuauit à lui résister, elle en mourrait."

7. His non obstantibus haud facile Consuela imperio matris adhaesit. Constat enim in primis exposcenti viro ut sibi nubere vellet nullum consensum puellam dedisse, sed lacrimas fudisse, ac postera die in ephemeribus vulgata nuptialia legisse, quae profecto haud iniverat. De dissidiis autem et iurgiis matrem inter et filiam propter huius voluntatem matrimonio adversantem sat testes loquuntur. —Equidem neminem habens ad quem posset confugere, ne ad patrem quidem, sive quia per divortii sententiam, qua eius pater et mater seiuncti erant, sub potestate solius matris constituebatur, sive quia ipsemet pater indomitae uxoris voluntatis influxum constanter fuerat perpessus, perdurantibus minis et obstinato matris consilio, nuptias tandem Consuela cum Carolo inivit. At vere dicendum in casu coactam Consuelam fuisse matrimonium eligere, ut sese a metu liberaret. Quod adeo verum est ut verens mater ne ultimo momento Consuela mutaret nubendi extortum assensum, die nuptiarum custodem posuerit ad eius portae cubiculum, ne quis ad illam accessum haberet et cum ea colloqueretur. Unde tanto moerore confecta matrimonium deinceps Consuela contraxit, ut pars ipsa conventa ad rem fassa fuerit: "Elle arriva très tard, et paraissait troublée."

8. Matrimonium tandem gravi sub metu a Consuela contractum nulla inde fuit ratificatione sanatum. Ad validationem enim consensus oporteret in casu ut scientiam calluerit actrix de matrimonii nullitate ex defectu consensus, matrimonialemque consensum renovaverit perdurantibus nuptiis. Porro inverisimile est canonica scientia praeditam Consuelam fuisse super impedimentis matrimonium irritantibus, eo vel magis quod sectae acatholicae erat inscripta; quae scientia ceteroquin in feminis non est praesumenda, sed e contra probanda (Cfr. l. 9 pr., D., *de iuris et facti ignorantia*, XXII, 6). Cum autem in casu nulla suppeditetur probatio de notitia impedimenti irritantis, cumque animorum dissociatio breve post tempus a matrimonii celebratione incoeperit et usque ad divortii sententiam perduraverit, ne fingi quidem potest in casu renovatio consensus ex parte Consuelae.

9. Quibus omnibus consideratis et sedulo perpensis, Christi nomine invocata, Nos infrascripti Auditores, pro tribunali sedentes et solum Deum prae oculis habentes, confirmata sententia Curiae Southwaroensis, decernimus, declaramus et definitive sententiamus: "Constare de matrimonii nullitate inter Consuelam Vanderbilt et Carolum De Marlborough" et sic proposito dubio respondemus *Affirmative*, statuentes praeterea eamdem Consuelam Vanderbilt ad omnes iudicii expensas teneri.

Ita pronunciamus, mandantes Ordinariis locorum et ministris tribunalium ad quos spectat, ut exsecutioni mandent hanc nostram definitivam sententiam, et adversus reluctantes procedant ad normam ss. canonum, et praesertim cap. 3,

sess. XXV, *De Reform.*, Concilii Trid., et can. 1924 Codicis I. C., iis adhibitis exsecutivis et coërcitivis mediis, quae magis opportuna et efficacia pro rerum adiunctis extitura sint.

Romae, in Sede Tribunalis S. R. Rotae, die 29 iulii 1926.

HENRICUS QUATTROCOLO, *Ponens.*
FRANCISCUS MORANO.
ARCTURUS WYNEN.
L. ✠ S.

Ex Cancellaria, die 7 augusti 1926.
T. TANI, *Notarius.*

[TRANSLATION.]

SACRED ROMAN ROTA.
SOUTHWARK.

OF NULLITY OF MARRIAGE (VANDERBILT—MARLBOROUGH).

Pope Pius XI, happily reigning in the fifth year of his Pontificate, on the 29th day of July, 1926, the Revv. Fathers Auditors of the Court, Henry Quattrocolo, Ponent, Francis Morano, and Authur Wynen, in the Southwark case of Nullity of Marriage, between CONSUELO VANDERBILT, *petitioner, represented by her lawful proxy, Nazarene Ferrata, advocate, and* CHARLES DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH, *the ex officio Defender of the bond intervening and arguing the case, have delivered the following definitive sentence in the stage of appeal.*

1. Consuelo Vanderbilt, born of an American and very wealthy family, but non-Catholic in religion, being baptized had reached her seventeenth year when she began to love a certain man named M..... R....., to whom she pledged herself secretly. But her mother, becoming acquainted with the fact, persistently refused to favor her daughter's wishes, nay more, seeking to make an end of the love in her daughter's heart she took her to Europe in the year 1894, and as Consuelo was a girl who "apportait jeunesse, beauté et grande fortune ainsi qu'une brillante éducation," she thought of giving her in marriage to some member of the nobility of England. And indeed in London she found Charles Duke of Marlborough and invited him to come and stay as a guest in her family by the sea at Newport in the United States of North America, whither the mother and daughter had returned. Charles accepted the invitation and betook himself to the town of Newport in the month of September, 1895, and stayed about fifteen days with the Vanderbilt family. On the day before taking his leave he offered a proposal of marriage to Consuelo herself who forthwith fled to her mother; but to no purpose; for the journals, at the mother's instance, had already published an announcement of the betrothal. Hence it came to pass that, after a visit to Canada, the Duke came back to Consuelo on the day appointed for the marriage, and contracted marriage with her in a Protestant church in New York on the 6th day of November, 1895, since he also belonged to a non-Catholic sect.

This marriage turned out unhappily; for a short time after the matrimonial contract the wife herself informed her husband that she had only gone to the

altar unwillingly and forced by her mother, and that she was in love in love with another man. For this reason their minds were in disagreement, and as the Duke gravely neglected his wife, after two children had been born of the marriage, in the year 1905 the parties at first ceased to live together; but in the year 1920 they obtained a civil divorce by mutual consent, and both of them entered upon other marriages. At length in the year 1925, in order to secure the nullity of her marriage with Charles the woman presented a petition to the Court of Southwark, which, when the process has been duly completed, delivered sentence of nullity of marriage under the head of force and fear, on the 9th day of February, 1926. The local Defender of the bond appealed to this Sacred Tribunal, whereupon the cause has now to be discussed again under the accustomed formula of doubt: "Is there evidence of nullity in the case?"

2. *In law.* In this case it is a question of reverential fear which assuredly, from the constant opinion of canonists, from the Code of Canon Law, and from the uniform jurisprudence of the Rota—if, apart from other conditions, it is directed to extort consent and is grave—renders marriage void. (GASPARRI, *De Matr.* n. 942, WERNZ, *Ius decr.* IV, n. 264; Can. 1087 Cod.; S. R. Rota, in Parisien, 27 Julii 1910; Tarvisina, 11 Mart. 1912; Transylvanien, 1 Maii 1912; N.N. coram Lega, 16 Maii 1912; Hyderabaden, 2 Aug. 1921.)

3. *In fact.* The Fathers considered in the first place that it must be observed that when the petitioner had given her promise of marriage to Mr. M..... R..... whom she loved warmly her mother strongly opposed this marriage and exerted all her strength to turn the mind of her daughter away from that man and prevent a marriage with him. On this point the petitioner testified: "Ma mère me détacha de l'influence de mon prétendant. Elle me fit quitter mon pays, intercepta toutes les lettres que m'adressait mon prétendant et celles que je lui adressais. Elle faisait de scènes continuelles. Elle disait que je devais obéir; qu'elle savait très bien que je n'avais pas le droit de choisir un mari; que je devais prendre l'homme de son choix; que mon opposition ruinait sa santé et que je pouvais être la cause de sa mort. Il y eut une terrible scène quand elle me dit que si je réussissais à me sauver, elle saisirait la première occasion pour fusiller mon prétendant, qu'elle serait alors mise en prison et pendue et que j'en serais responsable." This statement is not only confirmed by the mother but also by witnesses, and indeed in regard to all the details, so that there can be no manner of doubt as to its truth.

4. But the Fathers likewise saw that not only did the mother irresistibly separate her daughter from the man she loved but also forced her to enter into marriage with the Duke of Marlborough. In this matter, since one who alleges fear ought to prove it not merely by some sort of proofs but by proofs which beget moral certitude as to the existence of the fear, the petitioner in this case has juridically testified many things which prove the fear in very deed. For she testified as follows: ". . . Ayant détruit la possibilité de mon mariage avec celui que j'aimais, ma mère ma dit qu'elle avait choisi un homme qu'elle regardait convenable à tous les égards, qu'il allait arriver en Amérique pour demeurer chez elle comme son hôte, qu'elle avait déjà négocié au sujet d'un mariage. . . . Je persiste à déclarer que si j'ai consenti au mariage avec le Duc de Marlborough,

ce fut sous la pression très forte de ma mère, et d'après sa volonté absolue. En plus de menaces, dont il est parlé ailleurs, ma mère me dit plusieurs fois que si je persistais à m'opposer à sa volonté, c'était, vu son état de santé, une contrariété telle qu'elle pouvait amener sa mort. Tel fut aussi l'avis du docteur, lequel me fut connu par une amie de ma mère, Mme. Jay, qui le tenait d'elle." Thus for the man whom her daughter loved, another was substituted by the mother who was attracted by the desire of a title of nobility, and seeing that Consuelo was gifted with all womanly grace and endowed with riches, when she had just made acquaintance with the Duke in London she straightway wanted to have him as her guest in Newport, not merely to suggest him to her daughter as a husband but to assign him definitely: "Elle disait que je devais obéir, qu'elle savait très bien, que je n'avais pas le droit de choisir un mari; je devais prendre l'homme de son choix."

5. Nevertheless, although the sworn testimony of one who has suffered fear is regarded in the law as a means of great moment in arguing the nullity of marriage on the ground of fear, for only one who fears can experience and know directly that trepidation of mind which others only know by tokens; still it has not the force of proof unless it be thoroughly confirmed by the deposition of other witnesses and by presumptions. But in the case, this is fully secured, whether by the attestation of witnesses or by presumptions. For the other party himself deposed that he knew from his wife about twenty days after the wedding that she had only contracted this marriage because she was constrained by her mother: "Elle m'a dit que sa mère avait insisté pour qu'elle se mariât avec moi; que sa mère était ardemment opposée à son mariage avec M. R., et que toute contrainte, poussée presque jusqu'aux violences physiques, avait été employée pour arriver à ces fins." But Consuelo's mother who caused this fear did not hesitate to confess and declare: "J'ai forcé ma fille à épouser le Duc. J'ai toujours eu une influence absolue sur ma fille, mes enfants m'ayant été entièrement confiés après mon divorce; j'avais eu seule leur éducation entre mes mains. Quand je donnais un ordre personne ne discutait. Je ne l'ai donc pas priée, mais commandée de se marier avec le Duc. . . . J'ai alors invité le Duc à venir me faire visite chez moi à Newport. Il vint et il resta environ 14 jours. Alors j'ai dit à ma fille que c'était lui le mari que j'avais choisi pour elle. Elle en fut toute bouleversée, et elle répondit qu'elle ne pouvait pas l'épouser. Je considérais que j'étais justifiée à passer outre à son opposition comme simplement la niaiserie d'une jeune fille sans expérience." In like manner the aunt of the petitioner testified: "Ce mariage a été imposé par ma sœur à sa fille, qui, je l'ai déjà, dit, désirait faire un autre mariage." Finally, Mrs. Lucy Jay, to the judge's question: "Estimez-vous que cette contrainte était simple persuasion, ou plutôt coercition?" affirmed on oath: "Aucune persuasion tout à fait, mais contrainte absolue, cela je le jure, je le sais." Now, since that proof ought to be considered full and perfect which is made by two witnesses above all exception (REIFF., lib. IV, tit. XIX, *de Divortiis*), it is clearly evident in this case that fear was caused, for the parties in the cause and the witnesses adduced, from the declaration of the Bishop of Southwark, of the Court of Paris, and of certain parish priests, are known as wholly trustworthy.

This conclusion is further confirmed in this case in another way by the aversion which Consuelo felt for the Duke. For in her sworn declaration the petitioner speaks thus of her husband's character: "L'arrogance de son caractère créa en moi des sentiments d'hostilité. Il avait l'air de mépriser tout ce qui n'était pas anglais, mon orgueil en fut offensé." The attestation of the petitioner's aunt is in close agreement with this affirmation in regard to the Duke's character.

6. Furthermore, the Fathers held that there was less reason to doubt in regard to the gravity of the fear in this case. For considering that there can be grave fear without threats or beating, and that the indignation of parents in itself is an evil, yea a grave evil, if it be grave and likely to endure for long, as the doctors commonly teach and Clericatus says expressly in the following words (*De Matrim.*, dec. 37, n. 24): "Reverential fear is considered in two ways, either with danger or without such danger. In the first manner when the son or daughter not obeying the father . . . reasonably fears to render him hostile, supercilious, of stern aspect, and not speaking placidly, and much more, &c., all which things are regarded as grave and unbearable evils for a son," on examining the documents in this case the gravity of the fear is evidently concluded. For all the witnesses show that the girl married Charles being conquered by the will of her indomitable mother, the danger of whose indignation was much to be feared by Consuelo if the marriage imposed upon her had not been contracted; more especially when it is considered that being gentle and mild and accustomed to obedience she was disposed to tremble and be subject to an imperious mother unaccustomed to contradiction and bending all things to her wishes. To this it must be added that if she did not marry Charles another grave evil and danger was to be feared by Consuelo, namely, the death of the mother herself, according to the doctor's opinion, which indeed the mother had often used as a threat to her daughter, as the petitioner testified in her third interrogatory: "En plus de menaces dont il est parlé ailleurs, ma mère me dit plusieurs fois que si je persistais à m'opposer à sa volonté, c'était, vu son état de santé, une contrariété telle qu'elle pouvait amener sa mort. Tel fut aussi l'avis du docteur, lequel me fut connu par une amie de ma mère, Mme. Jay, qui le tenait d'elle." This sworn testimony is confirmed by Mrs. Tiffany, the petitioner's aunt, who says: "Ma sœur faisait des scènes continuelles à sa fille, et essayait de l'attendrir en lui disant qu'elle avait une maladie de cœur, et que si elle continuait à lui résister, elle en mourrait."

7. Notwithstanding all these things, Consuelo did not easily consent to the command of her mother. For it is evident that when the man first asked her to marry him the girl gave no answer, but shed tears; and the next day she read in the journals the announcement of a betrothal which she had not contracted. And the witnesses have enough to say concerning the disputes and reproaches between mother and daughter because of her opposition to this marriage. Indeed, having no one to whom she could fly—not to her father, whether because by reason of the sentence of divorce which separated her father and mother she was placed under the authority of her mother alone, or because the father himself had constantly suffered the influence of his unconquerable wife—under these continual

threats and the firmly set purpose of her mother, Consuelo at last contracted marriage with Charles. But it is truly to be said that in this case Consuelo was compelled to choose marriage to deliver herself from fear. So true is this, that the mother fearing lest Consuelo at the last moment might change her extorted consent to marrying, set a guard at the door of her chamber on the day of her marriage, so that no one could have access to her and speak with her. Hence Consuelo then contracted the marriage so overcome with sadness that the other party himself bore testimony: "Elle arriva très tard, et paraissait troublée."

8. Lastly, the marriage contracted by Consuelo under grave fear was not made good afterwards by any ratification. For in such a case it would be necessary for the validation of consent that the petitioner should be aware of the nullity of the marriage from the defect of consent, and that she should renew the matrimonial consent while the marriage was still enduring. Now it is unlikely that Consuelo had knowledge of Canon Law regarding the diriment impediments of matrimony, the more so because she belonged to a non-Catholic sect. Moreover, such knowledge is not to be presumed in women, but must be proved (Cfr. l. 9 pr., D., *de juris et facti ignorantia*, XXII, 6). But since in this case no proof is supplied of knowledge of the diriment impediment, and since the disagreement of mind between the parties began soon after the celebration of the marriage and lasted until the sentence of divorce, a renewal of consent in this case on the part of Consuelo cannot even be imagined.

9. Having considered and carefully weighed all these things, and having invoked the name of Christ, we the undersigned Auditors, sitting as a tribunal and having God alone before our eyes, confirming the judgment of the Court of Southwark, do decree, declare, and definitively give judgment: "That there is evidence of the nullity of the marriage between Consuelo Vanderbilt and Charles of Marlborough"; and thus we answer the proposed doubt *affirmatively*, decreeing moreover that the said Consuelo Vanderbilt is bound to pay all the expenses of the judgment. So we pronounce, directing the local Ordinaries and ministers of tribunals whom it may concern to put in execution this our definitive judgment, and to proceed against those who oppose it in accordance with the sacred canons, and especially Chapter 3, Session XX, *De Reform*, of the Council of Trent, and canon 1924 of the Code of Canon Law, making use of such executive and coercive means as may seem to be most opportune and efficacious in the circumstances.

At Rome, in the Seat of the Tribunal of the Sacred Roman Rota, 29th day of July, 1926.

HENRY QUATTROCOLO, *Ponent.*
FRANCIS MORANO.
ARTHUR WYNEN.

L. ✠ S.

From the Chancellery, 7th day of August, 1926.

T. TANI, *Notary.*

QUESTIONS ANENT MOTHER SETON'S CONVERSION:— A CORRECTION

In Vol. V, Numbers 2-3 (July-October, 1919), pp. 223 and foll. of THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, I asserted that, since Ash Wednesday in the year of grace 1805 fell on February 27th, the historians of Mother Seton who have repeated in unison after Dr. C. I. White that she was received into the Church on "Ash Wednesday, March 14, 1805," have been in error. I further set out to explain accordingly the passages of Mrs. Seton's letter to Mrs. Amabilia Filicchi, and of her *Dear Remembrances* which seem to lend coloring to the common mistake and to contradict my main statement.

Whilst maintaining this main statement as I must, for the calendar is adamant, I wish in this note to modify the interpretation which I then advocated of the passage of the *Dear Remembrances*. This passage I quoted, C.H.R., p. 225, as it is edited, punctuation and all, by Msgr. R. Seton[1]; and for convenience's sake reproduce it here once more:

> The thousand prayers, and tears, and cries from the uncertain soul which now succeeded until Ash Wednesday, 14th March, 1805, it entered the Ark of St Peter with its beloved ones.

In the article referred to above notice was taken that the whole sentence in the original manuscript preserved in the archives of St. Joseph's, Emmitsburg, scarcely contains any punctuation marks—a feature quite common in old documents, and quite characteristic of Mrs. Seton's style of writing; and doubts were expressed as to whether the editor, in introducing *his* punctuation marks, had grasped correctly the meaning of his grandmother's text. Instead of his reading, incompatible with the calendar, I ventured to suggest this other:

> . . . which now succeeded until (Ash Wednesday—14th March 1805) it entered. . . .

Sometime ago an opportunity was afforded me to examine closely the original; and since that time I have been able to study at leisure the good photograph which I took of that page. No doubts now remain in my mind that Msgr. Seton's reading, as made clear by his punctuation, is incorrect. Wrong likewise is the interpretation which I suggested. I wish, therefore, to make amends to Mother Seton for my awkward treatment of her text; and I am convinced that I can now furnish the key to this exegetical puzzle.

In order to enable the reader to decide, I submit here, as exactly as can be done in type, the text of the whole paragraph.

> at night prayers when Nina[2]
> said oh ma let us say hail
> Mary, do ma said Willy[3], and
> hail Mary we all said little
> bec[4] looking in my face to

---

1 *Memoir, Letters and Journal of Elizabeth Seton*, 2 Vols., New York, 1869.
2 Anna Maria, often called familiarly Annina, Mrs. Seton's oldest child. See C.H.R., Vol. V, p. 233.
3 William, her second child. See C.H.R., *Ibid.*
4 Rebecca, her youngest child. See C.H.R., Vol. V, p. 234.

catch the words she could
not pronounce but in a
manner which w.d have
made All laugh if Mothers
tears had not fixed their
attention - - - - the thousand
tears of prayers and cries from
the uncertain Soul which now
succeeded, until Ash wednesday
14th March 1805 it entered the
Ark of St Peter with its beloved
ones - - - -

These lines bear out what was said touching the freaks of punctuation: in all there are only three commas, the first two of which even might be to advantage changed into something else; no periods, not even at the end of the paragraph. Now it will be noticed that the words: "Ash wednesday" come at the end of a line; I may add further that, for lack of space, the last two letters are ill-formed and run into each other; there is no place left for so much as a dot, even if Mother Seton was minded to introduce logically a period at this place.

My contention is that she was so minded, and that the sentence in that crucial passage closes with the words: "Ash wednesday"; another sentence beginning with "14th March 1805": so that we should read:

. . . which now
succeeded, until Ash wednesday.
14th March 1805 . . .

This construction of Mother Seton's text accords perfectly with the requirements of the calendar; it has to recommend it its utmost simplicity and naturalness, besides Mother Seton's extremely sparing use of punctuation marks; it moreover removes the antecedent improbability of Mother Seton's being received in the Church the very first time she went to St. Peter's.

That this indeed was actually not the case is now made certain beyond doubt or cavil by a letter[5] written on March 16, 1805, to Father Cheverus by Anthony Filicchi who, it will be remembered, was instrumental in Mother Seton's conversion, and assisted at her reception into the Church on the morning of March 14th, 1805:

> . . . The happy result has been that enlightened and strengthened in the true faith by the Holy Ghost, she went the day before yesterday morning to our Church, *where she had previously been several days at Mass*,[6] and having called on our Rev.d Dr. O'Bryan she formally abjured in my presence her past errors, and made the requisite profession of faith of the Rom. Catholick Church. Be sure that she will be a pattern of piety. . . .

What can be clearer than this testimony of the *testis omni exceptione major* in the case? Previous to March 14, we are told Mrs. Seton had been several days at Mass at St. Peter's. Whatever obscurities may remain in her letter to Mrs.

5 Archives of the Filicchi Family, Leghorn, Italy.
6 Italics mine.

Amabilia Filicchi, its wording leaves no doubt that Ash Wednesday (February 27), was the day when, tramping courageously upon all the hesitations of her "uncertain soul," she stamped them out by definitely yielding to the persistent solicitation of grace which bade her go to St. Peter's.

The above passage of Filicchi's letter contains yet more, which, since the opportunity offers, I cannot forbear mentioning presently. The reader did not fail to notice that the devoted friend of Mrs. Seton speaks of her abjuration and profession of faith, but says not a word about her being baptized, even conditionally,—certainly by far a more important and impressive feature of the day than the other two. Wary as we must always be in the face of an *argumentum a silentio*, how can the conclusion be resisted that, if Filicchi, who was present, recounts the abjuration and profession of faith, but is silent about baptism, the sole reason of his silence is that no baptism, even conditional, was administered?

This view I set forth seven years ago on other grounds; on the force of this silent testimony of Anthony Filicchi, I am now more convinced than ever that it is the correct one.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C.M.,
Kenrick Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.

DOCUMENT

THE CARDINALS, ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL: PEACE AND BENEDICTION IN OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, TEACHER OF THE TRUTH THAT MAKES US FREE

Sympathy for those who suffer for conscience sake has never been refused by the great heart of the American people. They, almost instinctively, sense all oppression to be a destroyer of unity at home, as well as an abundant source of the misunderstandings and hatreds that divide nations and peoples and injure the cause of international amity and world peace. If then we, as American Bishops, had no other reason for issuing this Pastoral than to show our deep sympathy with the suffering people of Mexico in the persecution now raging against religion in that country, it would be justified; but there are other reasons, carrying even greater weight and urgency, that make of this act a duty. They are found in the fact that Mexico is our neighbor—with all the power that propinquity gives to the force of good or evil example—a republic which it was intended should be modeled on lines similar to ours, and a nation with a Christian population whose devotion to the Catholic Church makes a special call upon the charity of the faithful everywhere, but more especially upon those of the United States.

Even stronger reasons for the issuing of this Pastoral arise out of the higher considerations of duty to those principles upon which all just government must be founded, principles which guard rights conferred upon man, not by states, but by God Himself. None, much less Bishops of the Church that holds the spiritual allegiance of almost the entire Mexican population, can be indifferent when these vital principles are attacked as boldly and as cruelly as is being done in Mexico to-day. This duty of defense and protest, first and most properly, has been recognized by the Bishops of Mexico themselves in admirably worded petitions against oppression as well as in timely, edifying and intimate letters to their flocks. Their action may well be seconded by us, their brothers separated by national frontiers, but nevertheless bound to them in the bonds of a common faith, as well as by ties of fraternal charity made stronger in mutual understanding, esteem and friendship.

All the more do we feel an obligation to speak boldly and publicly on the religious persecution raging in Mexico, because the common Father of Christendom, Pius XI, Vicar of Jesus Christ, has urged the faithful of the whole world to unite with him in sympathy and prayer to God for the afflicted Church. He thus manifests at once his deep sorrow over her trials and his keen perception of the danger that this persecution threatens to "the peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ" everywhere. He who has made it plain that his dearest wish, as well as the supreme motive of all his official actions, is nothing less than the reign of the Prince of Peace over all hearts, and who offers a sick and disturbed

world the remedy of the Master's teachings and the Master's love, has, by his timely appeal, recognized its gravity and the threat it carries to religion the world over.

Yet another and still stronger motive urges us to speak. It is that the present conflict, as one part of a war against religion in Mexico which had its inception almost a century ago, to a greater degree than any preceding it comes from an attempt at nothing less than the destruction of the Divine Constitution of the Church by reducing her to the status of a state-controlled schismatical body, without the right to form, train and educate her own clergy, to have a sufficient number of them for the care of souls, to find means for her support, to develop works in accord with her mission of charity and enlightenment, and to apply the teachings of the Gospel to the formation of a public conscience. Sad experience, as well as right reason, tells us what would follow the success of such an attempt, and what it would mean to Church as well as to State.

The Mexican Church thus controlled and bound, as the civil power seeks to control and bind her, nominally might be separated, but really would be a department of the political machinery of the State. Her dignities and offices would be the perquisites of politicians; her voice the changing voice of political action. She would be despised by her faithful and justly mocked by her enemies. Her bond of unity with the Church Universal would first be weakened and then snapped asunder. The Mexican Government asks the Church to accept a slavery that could mean nothing to-day but an infection caught from evil surroundings, and tomorrow a decline into mortal sickness inevitably ending with her passing from the life of the Mexican people.

To the State would come no less evil results. With the check of religious influence gone, history for her also would be repeated. She would forget her dreams of democracy and actually become a despotism. Corruption would increase with power to confer ecclesiastical emoluments upon the unworthy. She would merit and receive the hatred of just men at home and the contempt of just men abroad. A "Holy Synod," doing the unholy work of despotism, would gradually absorb her strength and seize her power as a most convenient machinery of government. Whatever of good is in her ideals would be shattered on one of the oldest rocks that lie hidden in the waters of political life.

The question that we are considering then is vital both to the Church and to the State. However blind may be the advocates of such plans in government to their evils, the Mexican Church prefers, if she must, to perish defending her Divine Constitution and the religious rights of her people rather than to accept the alternative of a slavery that would mean the disgrace of faithlessness, as well as ultimate ruin to her spiritual mission. In fact, the Church in Mexico has no choice; for merely to continue her public religious functions under these oppressive and unjust conditions would be an open declaration that she had submitted to them, and thus had taken a first step toward divorcing herself from the unity of the Church Universal.

If then, because of the fact that the persecution in Mexico is directed against all the principles of religion, we should speak as the servants of God; if, because it is unloosed particularly against the religion of the majority of the people

33937

of Mexico, we should speak as Catholics; there are grave reasons, too, why we have a duty to speak as Americans attached to the institutions of our country and loving them for the benefits they have conferred upon us all. The Government of Mexico has, indeed, by its actions in our very midst, made it necessary that we should no longer guard silence, for it has carried its war on religion beyond its own boundaries through organized propaganda in many countries, but especially in our own.

Through its diplomatic and consular agents in the United States that Government appeals to the American people to justify its actions. In consequence we have before us the extraordinary spectacle of a foreign government, not only filling our country with propaganda in favor of its own internal plans and policies, but even attempting to justify and defend, in our nation, laws and conduct at variance with fundamentals set down in imperishable documents by the Fathers of this Republic. Misinterpreting our good-natured tolerance for a neighbor still disturbed by consequences of many military upheavals, the Government of Mexico has thus presumed to appeal to our fellow citizens for approval. This actually amounts to the submission of its case for judgment to a court beyond its own boundaries; pleading, not before its own citizens who, according to its Constitution, form the only court competent to pass upon it, but before strangers who claim no jurisdiction over their neighbor's political affairs, and whose only interest in them is a desire for the well-being of the people of Mexico and their own peace in amicable mutual relations. The Government of Mexico cannot, therefore, object, under such circumstances, if the case it has thus presented for judgment be considered in the light of American principles, as embodied in our fundamental laws, and in the light of Christian principles, since it appeals for the sympathy of Christians; nor, since it claims great zeal for the advancement of education, if the statements it has presented in support of its pleading be submitted to the test of history. These are the things we purpose to do, so that, not only will our own citizens be fully informed of the interests at stake, but the Mexican people will not be without benefit of advocate before the court to which their rulers have actually but mistakenly appealed.

PART I

The Government of Mexico bases its case upon repeated assurances that it is merely enforcing the Constitution and fundamental laws of the Mexican nation. It will not be out of place then to compare this constitution and these laws with our own, at least in so far as they affect the rights of conscience. In no better way can the points at issue be made clear.

The difference between the conception of civil and religious freedom upheld by the American Constitution and that of the makers and defenders of the present Constitution of Mexico will be best understood by contrasting the two instruments. This will show, that only by slurring over or concealing the actual facts of the case can the Mexican Government hope to secure the sympathy of thoughtful and unbiased Americans, whose ideas of civic justice and right are radically different from those expressed in Mexican law. The contrast will prove this without argument. Certainly there is no basis for argument, unless it be in an attempt, not to reconcile our policies with those of the Mexican Government,

but to prove that ours are wrong. In fact, what the Government of Mexico actually asks us to do, in begging our sympathy and approval, is nothing less than to condemn the work of the Fathers of this Republic, registers dissatisfaction with the Constitution they gave us, and demand its overthrow; for no American can accept the Mexican theory of Government as being in accord with fundamental justice without repudiating his own traditions and ideals. The very audacity and boldness of the Mexican Government in thus appealing to us for sympathy in favor of laws and conduct at variance with our most cherished political convictions has been, perhaps, the chief reason why the fact of their opposition to these convictions has been overlooked. Possibly it is for the same reason that some Christian people everywhere have overlooked also the fact that the present Government of Mexico is making war on one of the essentials of Christianity, namely, liberty of conscience, on which Leo XIII clearly set forth the Christian position. "Another liberty," he writes, "is widely advocated, namely, liberty of conscience. If by this is meant that everyone may, as he chooses, worship God or not, it is sufficiently refuted by the arguments already adduced. But it may also be taken to mean that every man in the State may follow the will of God, and, from a consciousness of duty and free from every obstacle, obey His commands. This, indeed, is true liberty, a liberty worthy of the sons of God, which nobly maintains the dignity of man, and is stronger than all violence or wrong—a liberty which the Church has always desired and held most dear. This is the kind of liberty the apostles claimed for themselves with intrepid constancy, which the apologists of Christianity confirmed by their writings, and which the martyrs in vast numbers consecrated by their blood. And deservedly so; for this Christian liberty bears witness to the absolute and most just dominion of God over man, and to the chief and supreme duty of man towards God. It has nothing in common with a seditious and rebellious mind; and in no tittle derogates from obedience to public authority; for the right to command and to require obedience exists only so far as it is in accordance with the authority of God, and is within the measures that He has laid down. But when anything is commanded which is plainly at variance with the will of God, there is a wide departure from this divinely constituted order; and at the same time a direct conflict with divine authority; therefore, it is right not to obey."[1]

In a thousand other passages this illustrous Pontiff, his predecessors and successors, have set forth Catholic teaching on this and kindred topics with which we are now concerned. The doctrines of the Church are not secrets. With her Master she can say, "*In secret I have spoken nothing.*"[2] According to that teaching, it is God's will, contained in both His natural and positive law, which is the first law of life, public and private. To discover that will through the searching process of a sincere and enlightened conscience, using the means which God has furnished, and then to follow its lead, is every man's native right and duty. "*This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him,*"[3] is the burden of the message of God to

1 *Encyclical*, "Libertas Praestantissimum," June 20, 1888.
2 *John* xviii, 20.
3 *Matthew* xvii, 5.

the human race. Therefore do we cling to Christ as *"the way, the truth and the life."*[4] He in turn charges His apostles and their successors with the task of continuing His mission of teaching and of sanctifying the coming generations. *"He that heareth you heareth Me and he that despiseth you despiseth Me."*[5] To them consequently the Catholic looks as to his authoritative guides in the pathway that leads to eternity. To these *"dispensers of the mysteries of God"*[6] the Catholic owes conscientious obedience in such matters as have been confided to their care by the chief shepherd of our souls, who is Christ. Only by arbitrary interference outside its own independent proper sphere of action can the State obstruct the due fulfillment of the pastoral ministry; and this the Mexican Government seeks to do, denying in effect the final authority of the will of God plainly expressed to man for his spiritual guidance, and by a bold act of arbitrary power invading its rights in favor of the State.

Passing from the consideration of the conception of civil and religious liberty in Constitutions to the Constitutions themselves, we are met with the plea of the Mexican Government that it is doing no more than enforcing its own. Here, however, at the outset, it is confronted with two important facts: first, that though the anti-religious laws of the country date[7] from 1857, yet no Government till now has ever attempted to give them full effect: and second, that, though these laws were reaffirmed and made more drastic in the Constitution of 1917, yet President Carranza himself suggested changing the clauses affecting religion,[8] and President Obregon never attempted to enforce all of them during the four years of his administration. These two facts show that it was tacitly recognized how far removed such laws were from justice and from the approval of the Mexican people. The appeal to the Constitution, however, does take our eyes off persons and, for the moment, directs attention to the written instrument by which such persons seek to justify their acts. It is in order, therefore, to inquire into the nature and purpose of a Constitution.

A written Constitution is an instrument which enumerates and defines the rights and duties of government, distributes its powers, prescribes the manner of their exercise, and limits them to the end that the liberties of the citizens may be preserved. Since the purpose of Government is to protect human rights, not to destroy them, it follows that the charter by which a government operates cannot contain a grant of unlimited power. For the exercise of such power would be tyranny, inasmuch as it would tend to destroy rights which both the natural and the positive laws of God place beyond the jurisdiction of men. Hence, in the commonly accepted American doctrine, a Constitution vests the Government with such rights and powers as are necessary for the proper exercise of its just functions, and at the same time forbids it to encroach upon rights of a higher order

4 *John* xiv, 6.
5 *Luke* x, 16.
6 *1 Cor.* iv, 1.
7 Previous to this date, the State endeavored to make the bishops and priests political appointees, and to legislate in Church affairs.
8 *Diario Oficial*, Nov. 21, 1918. Bill to modify Art. 3.
Diario Oficial, Dec. 17, 1918. Bill to modify paragraphs VII, VIII and XVI of Art. 130.

which come to men, not from the people, nor from the State, nor from any aggregation of states, but from the Creator of both men and states, Almighty God. This conception is wholly in keeping with the teaching of the Catholic Church.

There can be no possible doubt, then, that protection of the natural and alienable rights of the individual is essential to the very notion of a Constitution. Unlimited power would need no Constitution, for a Constitution is a guarantee of liberty, not an engine of tyranny. No such doctrine, whatever its origin, can win respect or exact obedience when it destroys these rights or enacts statutes which makes their exercise morally impossible. For such an instrument is not in accord with that right reason which vindicates man's natural rights. "Human law is law only by virtue of its accordance with right reason," says St. Thomas Aquinas, "and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is no law at all, but rather a species of violence."[9]

This, indeed, is the force of the Declaration of Independence, a document rightly regarded by all Americans as the cornerstone of this Government. With the Signers, we hold certain truths "to be self-evident." We agree that "all men," Mexicans included, "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men. . . ." Plainly, then, these rights are held by every man, not by the tolerance or grant of any State, but by the immutable decree of Almighty God. It is not within the authority of any Government to destroy or to hamper them. On the contrary, it is the solemn duty of the Government "to secure" them; and the Government which attacks them must be repudiated by all right-minded men. In the words of St. Thomas, its action is not law "but rather a species of violence." On this teaching St. Thomas and the Declaration of Independence are in complete accord.

Now while it is not easy, as the Supreme Court has recently declared, to enumerate all the rights which are comprehended under the primal right "to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," it is certain, as the same Court has held, in a very important case,[10] that among them is the right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience. Let it be further observed that the constant and unvarying interpretation of the Federal Constitution by the Courts bears out our contention that the Government exists to protect the citizen in the exercise of his natural and unalienable rights, and that it may enact no law which destroys them.

Constantly, too, has the Catholic Church upheld this conception of government under whatever form it may be exercised. Unlimited power over the liberty of the citizen is not Christian teaching. It is not the teaching of the Fathers of this Republic. It is not the doctrine of our Courts, which have again and again rejected it. To frame a Constitution or to enact legislation which makes impossible man's enjoyment of his natural heritage of liberty, is not within the legitimate power of any civil government, no matter how constituted. For this heritage descends to him by the natural law which "is coveal with mankind" and

9 *Summa, 1a, 11ae, Q.* xciii, Art. 3.
10 Meyer vs. Nebraska, 262, U. S., 390.

since it "is dictated by God Himself," as Blackstone writes in his celebrated Commentaries,[11] "it is of course superior in obligation to any other . . . No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original." The legislator, opposing the dictates of this law, cannot prescribe a course which is reasonable, or which is profitable to the community, and since his act in no way reflects the wisdom of the natural law, which is the wisdom of the Eternal Lawgiver, it is not law, and can impose no obligations upon any citizen. It merits respect from no just man, and least of all from Americans whose theory of government it outrages. Thus it is seen that the wisdom of Christian teaching has not failed to impress itself on the minds of distinguished men whose studies and writings on law have won for them deserved eminence before their fellows. In this connection we recall words written in our Pastoral of 1919: "The end for which the State exists, and for which authority is given it, determines the limit of its powers. It must respect and protect the divinely established rights of the individual and the family. It must safeguard the liberty of all, so that none shall encroach upon the rights of others. But it may not rightfully hinder the citizen in the discharge of his conscientious obligations, and much less in the performance of duties he owes to God."

These words are in accord with both the natural and the positive laws of God. They are in accord with the recognition of these laws by the Founders of our Republic. To give practical effect to them the First Amendment to the Constitution, forbidding Congress to prohibit the free exercise of religion, was adopted, and by degrees a similar prohibition was inserted into the Constitutions or Bills of Rights of the several States. These guarantees are more than part of the Federal Constitution and of the Constitutions of the respective States. They are part of the Constitution of the rights of free men. The Church has never been in disaccord with them, for, while she has been careful always to safeguard peace and oppose discord by protecting legitimate authority, she has not failed to point out to the civil authority its duties to the people as well as its responsibilities to God. Through her theologians, among whom may be cited St. Thomas Aquinas, Blessed Robert Bellarmine and Suarez, she has indicated the rights of the people with which no State and no ruler may interfere, insisted that they are beyond and above the statutes made by kings and senates, because deriving their sanction, not from the will and power of earthly authority, but from the authority of God and the dignity of man as an intelligent being.

It is not possible to hold that modern progress has antiquated or set aside this truth of the Divine source of all authority, for it is not within man's power to destroy that which is true, nor yet within his power to change that which is unchangeable. Truth is fixed and immutable. It is possible to discover new beauty in truth so that it shines brighter to the eyes of man, but its light cannot be extinguished. Light does not fight light but dissolves into it according to the universal law of its essential unity. Nor is it possible to hold that, under exceptional circumstances, a nation may acquire or take the right to set aside the principles upon which just government is builded and thus interfere with the funda-

11 *Commentaries*, Intro., sec. 2.

mental rights of conscience for the supposed good of the State. The State cannot benefit by wrong, and rights given by God are beyond the legitimate power of man to suspend or to cancel.

The individual citizen does not then resign to society all the rights that he possesses as a free man, as some would have it appear, receiving back only a portion of them as a gift from the State, while nominally retaining in himself a sovereignty that actually is exercised by those who rule in his name. This doctrine, well known to the Fathers of the Republic, was nevertheless rejected by them. The Government of Mexico, by insisting on obedience to a Constitution made without reference to justice by a handful of military rulers, contrary to human rights and never submitted to the people for ratification, insists that the individual citizen has no rights that his Government is bound to respect; that there are no limits to the powers of Government. No doctrine could be more certain than that to sweep out of existence the sturdy self-reliance of a people, to sow discord within and enmity without. The power of the State, coming from God, may be bestowed by the people, but when thus bestowed, it does not and cannot include what is not within the competency of the State to accept. Had God ordained the rule of the State over the soul and conscience, He would have given the State the means to direct conscience and control the operations of the soul, since he gives means to the end. The sanctuary of the soul and of conscience the State cannot invade. It is precisely this that the Government of Mexico seeks to do, and then to justify, before a people whose national ideals are in direct contradiction to the evil spirit of despotism and tyranny that actuates the laws and the rulers now making of Mexico a shocking example of wrong to the whole civilized world. It is plain then that there was no exaggeration in the language of Pope Pius XI when he characterized these laws as "diabolical."

Passing now from consideration of the Constitutions themselves, we may, with better informed minds, contrast the laws founded upon them by Mexico and by our own Republic.

American laws recognize the right of the citizen to worship God "according to the dictates of his conscience" and in order that this freedom may be assured him, religious societies are recognized as corporate legal entities having power to possess what property they need to carry out their mission. Furthermore, that mission is recognized as being, not only religious in root and trunk, but as bearing flowers and fruit in works of education and social welfare. Religious societies may, therefore, own land and upon it erect such buildings as are necessary for their purposes. They may establish, own and direct schools, colleges, universities, asylums, hospitals, and other institutions of education and social welfare. They may, as legal entities, protect their property rights by recourse to due process of law. They may possess endowments for the benefit of these activities and receive bequests. They may have seminaries wherein their clergy are trained and educated. Over and above all this, property owned by them, when used for purposes of worship, charity or education, almost universally with us is specially exempt from taxation; not only because it is recognized as of utility to the public welfare, but also in order to carry into effect the spirit of the national will which, expressing itself through the Continental Congress, says: "Re-

ligion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." [12] In this connection the words of our first President are eloquent: "And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever me be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."[13]

This condition has obtained since the formation of the Republic. It has worked out for the benefit of the State and of the people. No one now seriously believes that it could be changed. It has become an accepted and highly esteemed part of our national life, because it recognizes the rights of conscience, encourages private initiative in the establishing of useful agencies for learning and charity, promotes peace, contentment and good-will among citizens, encourages the enforcement of wise and good laws as well as the practice of the civic virtues, and allows to religion freedom in its own sphere for its teachings and for the cultivation of the spiritual life of the people. It has stood the test of nearly one and a half centuries, and the American people to-day are undoubtedly more than ever convinced of the desirability of its continuance. While with us there is no union of Church and State, nevertheless there is full and frank recognition of the utility of religion to good government. Hence the American State encourages religion to make greater and greater contributions to the happiness of the people, the stability of government and the reign of order.

In contrast with this, according to the present Constitution of Mexico, no religious society may enjoy the right of corporate legal existence.[14] Officially, there are no Churches in Mexico; for a Church cannot possess anything, lacks the right of petition for redress of grievances, cannot sue or be sued in the civil courts, and in general is entirely without legal standing. Clergymen are disfranchised by the fact of ordination.[15] A Church cannot own the buildings in which its public worship is held.[16] It cannot possess endowments.[17] It cannot take up a collection or a subscription outside the doors of the building used for religious services. That building, however, is owned by the Government, though paid for and supported by the people. The Government merely allows the rightful owner to use it at the good pleasure of state officials.[18] All Churches in Mexico, therefore, have to be supported by collections during the services. Now Churches are mainly supported everywhere by subscriptions accepted apart from the acts of worship themselves. With us, nearly all church building is paid for in that way. This is forbidden in Mexico, not by a mere regulation, but by constitutional enactment.[19]

---

12 Northwest Ordinance, Art. 3.
13 Farewell Address.
14 Constitution of 1917, Art. 130. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 5.
15 Const. 1917, Art. 37, § III.
16 Const. 1917, Art. 27. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 6.
17 Const. 1917, Art. 27, § 11. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 21. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 6.
18 Const. 1917, Art. 27, § 11. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 22.
19 Const. 1917, Art. 130. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 14.

In order to make this enactment effective, a Church is not allowed to possess houses for its bishops, priests, ministers, teachers or superintendents. Its future may not be provided for, because it cannot have a seminary in which a clergy may be trained to take places made vacant by death or incapacity. The fact that a Church uses a building is considered good ground for holding that it really belongs to that religious body. It may then be seized and confiscated. If a clergyman even rents a home for himself, the law provides that it may be seized on mere suspicion. Relatives of clergymen are threatened with the loss of their own personal property by confiscation on the ground that such property really belongs to a Church, for the law decrees that mere suspicion in such a case is full ground for the presumption that the property is held for the Church.[20] All property devoted by religious bodies to educational or charitable purposes is subject to confiscation.[21] In order to make it impossible for a Church to secure a building of any kind, it is provided that, in case of seizure, no trial by jury shall be allowed should its real owner appeal for justice.[22]

A Church, therefore, cannot own anything, cannot provide for its current expenses, cannot provide for a future clergy. A native clergy is thus made impossible, a fact which ordinarily would throw the burden of the religious care of the people upon strangers. To prevent the possibility of that happening, however, the law provides[23] that no clergyman but a native-born Mexican may officiate in any act of worship; and in consequence foreign clergy have been expelled. Thus the law first makes it impossible for the people to have a native clergy and then impossible to have a foreign clergy; while the Government keps assuring the world of its liberality and that there is no religious persecution in Mexico.[24]

The effect of such laws is felt in more than the spiritual work of the Church. It is also the ruin of works of education and charity. Religion fosters education. Practically all the great universities of the United States, for example, were founded by religious organizations, except the State universities, and even some of these owe their beginnings to clergymen or to religious bodies, while all owe to them the inspiration that gave them birth. It would be true to say that not one-third of the colleges and universities of the United States would be in existence to-day had it not been for the educational activity of the Churches. Almost every American-born statesman and scholar up to 1840 was educated in schools established under religious auspices. Now the Mexican Constitution provides[25] that no clergyman may teach in a primary school, or manage higher schools except on conditions impossible for him to accept. No college under private control may

20 Const. 1917, Art. 27, § II.

21 Const. 1917, Art. 27, § III. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 4.

22 Law of Nov. 25, 1926. Const. 1917, Art. 130.

23 Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 1. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 8. Const. 1917, Art. 130.

24 *Foreign Affairs* for October, 1926. "The Policies of Mexico To-day" by Plutarco Elias Calles, page 4. "In conclusion, I wish to lay stress upon the fact that a real religious problem does not exist in Mexico. I mean that there is no such thing as persecution of a religious character against religious creeds or opposition on the part of the government to the dogmas or practices of any religion."

25 Const., 1917, Art. 3. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 4.

give a degree recognized by the State.[26] All religious teaching Orders have been suppressed[27] and the formation of such Orders made illegal.

Sadder still is the effect of such laws on works of charity, a special field for religious efforts. Churches have always been, and still are, the principal sources of relief for the sick and the poor. More than sixty percent of the hospital beds in the United States are in religious institutions. To make it certain that Churches will not engage in such corporal works of mercy, the Mexican law confiscates institutions of charity and forbids the existence of any religious band of self-sacrificing men and women devoted to their service. In consequence, Mexico is to-day full of ruined institutions of charity, and its sick and poor are without protectors.

Again, under the Mexican law the religious press is permitted to exist only on condition of giving up its liberty. The laws and even the acts of public officials cannot be criticized by a religious paper under severe penalties, not even by secular papers betraying a religious bias.[28] Several religious papers have already been suppressed, and even certain daily papers of large circulation that were not religious but were at least sympathetic with religion. How far such laws depart from the American ideal is shown by the Virginia Bill of Rights and other similar acts.

It is scarcely necessary to set down the conclusions that naturally flow from the contrast we have made. They are at once apparent and must convince right thinking men and women that there can be no relationship between the principles upon which the Mexican Constitution is built, the laws that embody them, the spirit with which it is proposed they shall be enforced, and the principles, laws and spirit that are held sacred by the American people.

In fact, such laws hark back to paganism. Were they to prevail they would show civil society to have been marching, not in advance, but in a circle; and again arriving, in this our day, at the point from which it started with the dawn of Christianity. Such laws, in reality, embody the pagan plan of government, for they differ from it not at all in effect, but only in the manner and form of attaining the result. The ancient pagan gave despotic authority to the State by deifying it in its origin, and often in its rulers and its actions. The founders of Rome were supposed to be children of the gods. Her emperors were saluted as "divine" and altars erected to them. Great men of Greece were honored likewise. Even to this day some earthly rulers receive quasi-divine honors. The legendary benefactor of the ancient tribes of Mexico and Central America is said to have been a white man worshipped as a god.[29] Thus paganism united earthly and divine power in a deified state. The program of this new paganism eliminates the divine so as to leave the earthly in full possession. But the result of both ex-

---

26 Const. 1917, Art. 130. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 15. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 4.

27 Const. 1917, Art. 5. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 6.

28 Const. 1917, Art. 130. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 13. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 16.

29 Orozco y Berra, *Hist. Ant.*, v. 1, pp. 63-67.

tremes is the same—the slavery of the individual. How far all this is from our convictions as Americans and Christians is immediately apparent.

PART II

A cause that has to be defended before the American people by concealing its underlying motives will not hesitate at having recourse to falsehoods and even to suppressing facts of history. Hence it is no surprise to find charges unproved and unprovable urged against the part played by Catholic missionaries in the task of planting religion and civilization in Mexico. This is all the more easily done because the great majority of the people who read and hear such charges have neither the time nor the leisure to give further attention to them, and, therefore, accept them as undisputed statements of historic facts. In consequence, it is believed by some, and the belief has been encouraged by propaganda efforts of the Mexican Government especially in our colleges, that these missionaries destroyed a superior civilization in Mexico to build on its ruins a national monument to ignorance and superstition. The popular mind has been fed with the falsehood that the Church not only gave nothing of value to the Mexican people, but planted amongst them what was harmful; refusing to improve their condition by establishing schools, and meriting their hatred for thus keeping them illiterate and backward for centuries.

Fair and honest consideration of the facts will show the frail foundation upon which such charges are built. There was once, in all probability, a pagan civilization in Mexico superior to the social and political condition of any other part of this hemisphere at the time, possibly excepting Peru; but it had disappeared long before the missionaries set foot on Mexican soil. Its depths we cannot probe. What the missionaries found, however, was not the fantastic Empire of the Aztecs, a creation of the imagination,[30] but a degraded land in which murder and cannibalism[31] had reached the dignity of religious rites. The old civilization, long since passed, had left part of its story preserved in legends and in ruins. The new civilization brought by the Spanish missionaries has its monuments still standing, and its deeds set down in historic writings. Its Laws of the Indies have been pronounced the most just code ever made for the protection of an aboriginal people.[32] If we contrast the condition of the Mexican Indian at the beginning of the nineteenth century with that of his northern neighbor, we see at a glance that the

---

30 José María Luis Mora, *Mexico y sus Revoluciones*, Paris, 1936, v. 4, p. 2 et seq. Mora explains that the aid of the masses for the revolt could not be enlisted with abstract ideas about independence, so it was necessary to inflame their passions with "fables" about the greatness of the Aztecs and the "barbarity" of the conquest and "three hundred years of slavery."

Hidalgo's rallying cry was defense of King and Religion. Alaman, v. I, p. 379.

31 Cortés, Third Letter to Charles V. Dead are devoured after battle. Bodies of roasted children found in provisions of enemy.

Las Casas. *Brevisima Relacion.* Dead and prisoners are devoured after battle.

Sahagún. Lib. II, Caps. II, XX, XXI, XXXII. Durán. Cap. LXXXI. Mendieta. Lib. II, Cap. XVI. Motolinia. Caps. 17, 19, 27. Pomar, Relacion. P. 17. *Recopilación de Indias.* 1-1-17. (Law forbidding cannibalism).

32 Lummis, *Awakening of a Nation*, Introduction.

work of the Catholic missionaries was well done. We find even that the work has not failed to show results down to our own day. The praises and honors showered on Juarez, for example, are not undeserved so far as his intelligence and ability are concerned; but these praises and honors are reflected back to the Church that he persecuted, the Church that had made a Juarez possible. Such an Indian as Juarez would be a wonder here, but he was no wonder in Mexico where great men came out of the Indian population, and are still coming out of it, because the Church, before her work was hampered and injured, had laid the foundation. Miguel de Cabrera was Mexico's greatest painter, but an Indian. Pandura and Valezquez were worthy of a place in the same hall of Indian fame. Altamirano was at once a great orator, novelist, poet and journalist, but likewise an Indian. Juan Esteban, a simple lay brother of the Society of Jesus, was so great as a primary teacher that families of Spain sent children across the ocean to secure for them the foundation of this Indian's original and most effective methods of instruction. Among orators, an Indian Bishop, Nicolas del Puerto, holds a place of distinction. In the realms of profound philosophy the world has produced few greater than Archbishop Munguia of Michoacan. Francisco Pascual Garcia was a great lawyer; Ignacio Ramirez a distinguished journalist; Rodriguez Gavan a fine poet as well as a journalist; Bartolomé de Alba a winning and solid preacher; Diego Adriano and Agustín de la Fuente were expert printers; Adriano de Tlaltelolco, a latinist as well. All these were Indians, as were the historians Ixtlilxochitl and Valeriano. Rincón wrote the best grammar in the Aztec tongue. He was, like De Alba, himself a descendant of the Kings of Texcoco. A bibliography of the books written by Mexicans before the First Revolution fills many large volumes and in it the Indian has no small place. To whom the credit? To the Church which the Mexican Government informs the world gave nothing to its country.

Baron Von Humboldt testified thus of the Mexico he visited: "No city of the new continent, without even excepting those of the United States, can display such great and solid scientific establishments, as the capital of Mexico."[33] Why, then, did Mexico advance to such a high place from the depths of savagery, there stop and begin to retrograde, while the United States went on and climbed to her present eminence? Ask that question of the closed university, the suppressed colleges, the empty schools, the confiscated monasteries and convents, students scattered in other lands, the muzzled press, the Laws of Reform, the sword, the gun, the violated ballot-box. One of these alone might have the power only to whisper the answer, but together they shout it so that the whole world may hear. It is an eloquent testimony to the wonderful work of the persecuted Church that to her, and to her alone, the credit is due that, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Mexico had proportionally more colleges and more students in them, as

33 *Political Essay on The Kingdom of New Spain.* Translated from the original French by JOHN BLACK, New York, 1811. v. 1. p. 159. "The capital and several other cities have scientific establishments which will bear a comparison with those of Europe." p. 139.

well as less illiteracy, than even Great Britain, a testimony given her by a writer in a recent number of a London magazine.[34]

That fine picture fades and is replaced by one of sadness when, more than a century ago, Mexico's internal troubles began. In two generations, she had lost what three centuries of peace and cultivation had won for her; her churches seized; her wealth, formerly dedicated to education and social welfare, turned over to the looter. The worst elements rose to power and for them power was merely the road to riches. The subversive Jacobin doctrines, an evil legacy carried like a taint in the blood from generation to generation, yet prevail; but the buildings of the Church, monuments of education and social betterment, still stand, changed, alas, to other and often ignoble uses. Solidly, often beautifully constructed, many remain as barracks, prisons, hotels and offices. To Mexico goes the glory of the first book, the first printing-press, the first school, the first college and the first university in the New World,[35] and to Mexico's Catholic missionaries should go her gratitude for these distinctions. To the evil philosophy of the Red Terror goes only the sad credit for a century of destruction. A French writer on social science said that "Private initiative begins where the intervention of power ends." In Mexico it is proposed never to permit it to begin since the power of the State is to have no end. Yet the State owes all its progress and success to the individual. All advance in education, for example, such as the science of pedagogy, the planning of methods, the proper division of studies, the balanced curriculum, are the contributions of individuals. Surely these neo-Jacobins must see the force of the words of a French writer who said of people under such a regime, that they "judged liberty to lie in restricting the liberty of others."

The charge that the Church accumulated an undue proportion of the land of Mexico and gathered to herself vast estates as well as money, on examination has been found to be a gross exaggeration. When the facts are examined in the cold light of history, and the actual figures are given to show of what this wealth consisted, the charge falls to the ground, for the so-called wealth of the Church was chiefly in the endowments of Mexican education and works of social welfare. Little land was owned by the Church,[36] and in part only did even the wealth

---

34 The *Month*, Oct. 1926, "Church and State in Mexico."

35 ICAZBALCETA. *Bibliografia Mexicana del Siglo XVI*. p. xvi. First Printing Press, 1536. First Book, *La Escala Espiritual*, 1537. First School, 1522. JUSTO SIERRA, *Mexico—Its Social Evolution*, p. 478. First College, 1533. CUEVAS, *Historia de la Iglesia Mexicana*, v. 1, p. 386. First University, 1553. CAVO, *Tres Siglos*, Lib. IV, 12.

36 HUMBOLDT. *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*. New York, 1811, v. 1, p. 174. "The lands of the Mexican clergy (bienes raices) do not exceed the value of 12 or 15 millions of francs." ($2,285,714.28 to $2,857,152.85).

COLECCIÓN DÁVALOS. v. 2, Doc. 361. ABAD Y QUEIPO says: "Mas: la poca propiedad de la iglesia y clero de América no consiste en posesiones." And in *Doc.* 363. "El valor de los bienes de estos piadosos destinos (capellanias y obras pias) se puede estimar prudencialmente en dos y medio 6 tres millones de pesos."

MORA, (*Obras Sueltas*. v. 1, 372), quotes a report made by the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, 1833, showing 129 farms and 3,331 city properties belonging

gathered for the endowments of education and social welfare come from the gifts of the people during a period covering three centuries in one of the richest countries in the world; for these endowments represented also the labor and self-sacrifice of thousands of religious men and women, working for nothing but their bread and raiment. The greater part of the wealth was, as we have stated, not that of the Church but of the country's educational and charitable agencies, and the amount itself has been greatly exaggerated for the purposes of propaganda.

When figures revealing the actual extent of these endowments are shown, and when they are contrasted with like endowments for educational and social welfare institutions here in the United States, it is plain that the charge that they constituted an undue part of the wealth of Mexico is not well founded. Three American universities[37] alone have endowments greater than all the educational and charitable institutions under the care of the religious Orders of Mexico. A certain single non-Catholic religious denomination here, and that not the largest, has far more invested funds than the Catholic Church in Mexico possessed, with all her works of education and charity, at the period of her greatest prosperity.[38] That particular denomination in this country to-day has twenty

---

to the religious orders of both sexes. The total income from these properties is given respectively as $147,047 and $631,762. The members of these orders according to that same report numbered 3,160. MORA'S estimate of Church wealth (minus its fictitious values) totals less than $120,000,000.

DUARTE, *Curiosidades Historicas*. p. 82, lists 861 farms and 22,649 city properties valued at $184,614,000. Various colleges and hospitals, even the Guild of Silversmiths, appear as owners.

See also note 41.

37 *World Almanac*, 1926, p. 392.

Harvard	$69,689,840
Columbia	57,456,803
Chicago	31,992,620
	$159,139,263

165 institutions possess $794,231,462 in endowments of $1,000,000 or more.

38 The Baptists are referred to for purposes of comparison, because the number of their communicants in 1916 happens nearly to equal the number of Mexicans in 1810. The comparison is as follows:

	Baptists (a)	Mexicans
Population	6,107,686	6,122,354 (b)
Churches	51,248	10,112 (c)
Clergy	36,926	7,341 (d)
Unproductive property	$173,705,800	$52,331,894 (d)
Productive property	$98,453,844	$64,073,180 (e)
Income	$43,055,007	$5,682,153 (f)
Total values	$272,159,644	$116,405,074 (g)

(a) *Baptist Year Book* 1916.

(b) 1810—NAVARRO Y NORIEGA. *Memoria*, in *Boletin de la Soc. de G. y E.* 2a Ep., v. 1, p. 281. Based on census of 1793 and Humboldt 1803.

(c) ROMERO, *Mexico and the U. S.* p. 97.

(d) MORA, *Obras Sueltas*, v. 1, p. 372. Citing report of Minister for Eccl. Affairs 1833, including 213 conventual establishments, valued at $21,300,000.

times the number of clergy, in proportion to its membership, and five times the number of church buildings.[39] Moreover, the history of the rise and development of educational and social welfare endowments here is almost identical with those in Mexico, at least in so far as religious motives entered into the effort. The whole foundation of popular and higher education in the United States was built by the religious denominations that had found a place in American life, as we already pointed out; so that if we took from American life all the educational and social welfare values that these pioneers put in it, we would have to-day less than half our present equipment. But here in the United States zeal began and encouragement builded; while Mexico's "patriots" destroyed and ate up her own substance and sold her birthright as, one by one, her schools were closed, her teachers driven out, and her welfare institutions turned over to other uses. Many of these were sold at nominal prices to enrich the families of the revolutionists.[40] Those that stand to-day are monuments to a zeal and devotion that promised great things for the Mexican people, but which is now fast becoming a memory of a light that once astonished by its brilliancy and power; for the early progress of Mexico under the care of its missionaries was the admiration of the world. But figures speak louder than words. The highest estimate of the wealth of the Church in Mexico ever offered even by her enemies was $250,000,000, including all the endowments. Without such educational and social welfare endowments, the property devoted to religion in the United States is estimated by the Federal Trade Commission at $2,820,220,000. With the endowments, it is estimated at seven billions of dollars. Proportionately the Mexican figure might

---

(e) *Ibid.*, less his fictitious values; for example: DR. MORA assumes $600.00 as the income of each parish priest, multiplies this by 20, and charges the product to capital.

(f) *Ibid.*, less his fictitious values: and includes the tithes for 1829 amounting to $2,341,152. Does not include alms or fees.

(g) *Ibid.*, less his fictitious values.

Including his fictitious values MORA'S figures show $181,116,754 total values and $7,456,593 total income.

According to ABAD Y QUEIPO the funds held in trust by the secular and regular clergy (1807) totaled $44,500,000. "Representación." *Colección Davalos.* v. 2. Doc. 263.

MORA estimates them to amount to $80,000,000. *Mexico y sus Revoluciones*, v. 1, p. 121. But in his *Obras Sueltas*, v. 1, p. 372, he follows Bishop ABAD Y QUEIPO ($44,500,000).

These funds were known as "capellanias y obras pias." Their disposition is indicated by $256,000 of "capellanias" and $220,630 of "obras pias" being listed with the funds belonging to the girls' college of San Ignacio in Mexico City. *Boletin*, etc., 3a Epoca, v. 5, p. 652.

39 This is based on the present population of Mexico, 14,234,799 (Census 1921; *World Almanac*, 1926) and the present number of priests, which is about 4,000.

40 MONJARDIN. OCURSO, etc., Mexico; Murguia Imprenta; 1862. This is an account of a lawsuit in which it is shown that a certain citizen purchased 50 confiscated properties, valued at $525,528 (in 1859 at $587,419), for $1,832.40 in cash, and government due bills that had cost him $40,077.90.

ROMERO, *Mexico and the United States*, p. 363. "The Church property . . . was sold . . . at a nominal price, payable partially in national bonds then selling at . . . about five per cent of their face value."

well be one fourth of the American. It was actually not even one tenth. When it was confiscated the Government realized far less than half of its estimated value.[41]

The history of the decline of education in Mexico begins with the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767. Shortly after came the debacle that has been going on ever since. There were few to take the place of the old teachers. College after college had to be given up, most of them closed by the predecessors of President Calles. Gomez Farias closed the University of Mexico, the first University on this continent, in 1833. Reopened by Catholics, it was closed again by Comonfort in 1857. Again reopened one year later, Juarez closed it in 1861. The liberal Cabinet of the weak Maximilian put an end to it in 1865. Later it descended to about the grade of a high school and, with some exceptions in certain departments, it has scarcely more than that rank to-day.

Bitter indeed was the lot of the people who had to witness, not only the confiscation of the educational and charitable foundations that were their own in every sense of the word, but to see, in the sweeping away of their endowments, the rise of usury and the exploitation of poverty in order to increase the wealth of a new moneyed class that revolution had made. The endowments of the Church institutions were almost exclusively invested in the development of Mexico's great agricultural resources at low rates of interest. The revenues from these investments went to the support of the country's educational and charitable institutions, the schools, the colleges, the orphan asylums, the homes for the aged and the hospitals. The investments themselves increased agricultural and industrial prosperity, even as the returns furthered intellectual and social progress. The very profession of the churchman made of his debtors his friends. But let an enemy tell the tale. We take it from a speech on the subject by Juan A. Mateos in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies, delivered on October 20th, 1893. "In the days of the old regime, when the clergy possessed a great number of city and country properties, year after year went by without the shameful evictions to which so many families are the victims to-day. The sordid avarice of the landlords of to-day has no compassion in contrast to the clergy who, animated by a spirit truly Christian, overlooked and excused. The Church loaned its capital at a low rate of interest, 4%, 5%, or 6% which was called the legal rate, a rate unknown to-day. Very rarely was a foreclosure notice published against a property pledged for a loan from these funds. For this reason I proposed, at the time of their confiscation, that a bank for the poor be established from the millions of the clergy, but my voice was drowned in the passions of the revolution. Because of this, the selfish interests and exactions of to-day have left homeless the many families who formerly enjoyed the tolerance and charity of the clergy." It was the revolutionary leader, President Juarez, who repealed the laws against usury by his decree of March 15, 1861. The work done for the people by this use of endowments practically constituted

41 "In April, 1866, the office reported a total of $62,365,516.41 of confiscated values. *Boletin de la Sociedad de Georgrafia y Estadistica*, 2a Epoca, v. 2, p. 388.

a land bank for the Mexican agriculturists.[42] Only a few years ago our own Government had to found such a bank in the United States for the relief of the farmers.

The charge has been made that the Church in Mexico had no definite program of social action, that her attitude has been one of opposition. The record of Catholic Spain in this respect toward Mexico was such as to justify the statement by a recognized authority on the history of the Mexican people that: "No other nation has founded so extensively such benefices in the colonies."[43] The Church was the first organization in Mexico to devote herself to the solving of the social question. But for sixty and more years she has not been free; yet, even before the revolution of 1910-11 broke out, she had already a program of social action, progressive, advanced and comprehensive, free of the spirit of caste, and not leading to turbulence and to unjust confiscation. This program of the Church was one of loyalty to the people of Mexico, generous, disinterested, and inspired by no political passion.

As early as 1903, Catholic delegates in the National Congress of Mexico introduced bills providing for the creation of rural co-operative banks. That year a Mexican Catholic Convention was held in the city of Puebla, and, among other problems, it discussed those of labor unions, of the Indians and of industrial education. Similar Congresses were held in succeeding years. In that of 1906, no less than twenty-nine reports were presented covering distinct phases of social action in which the Church was at that time engaged in Mexico. At the Congress held in 1909, in the city of Oaxaca, practically the entire time of the Congress was devoted to the discussion of the Indian problem.[44]

It was a group of Catholic delegates to the Congress of Mexico that introduced bills giving legal status to labor unions, providing for Sunday rest, and a Workmen's Compensation Act. In the State of Jalisco, where in 1912 the Catholic members constituted a majority in the State Legislature, statutes were enacted protecting the property rights of wives and children, protecting the rights of minorities and granting a legal status to labor syndicates. One needs but read Catholic publications of that time to know with what zeal the Catholic people and the Catholic clergy of Mexico were devoting themselves to social questions in that country when their action was free. In March, 1913, the National Catholic Party, assembled in Guadalajara, discussed a program which included such points as municipal autonomy, the land problems, rural co-operative banks and the property rights of wives and children; the mere enumeration of which shows how far not only the Party, but the Catholic people of Mexico, had advanced in the solution of the social problems of that day. The Catholic Labor Unions of Mexico, at their convention held in 1913 in the city of Zamora, adopted resolu-

42 MORA, *Mexico y sus Revoluciones*, v. 1, p. 121.
RAMOS ARIZPE. In *Boletin de la Soc. de G. y E. Primera* Ep., v. 1, p. 137.
JOSE GUADALUPE ROMERO. *Boletin de la Soc. de G. y E. Segunda* Ep. v. 3, p. 556. MATIAS ROMERO, *Mexico and the U. S.*, p. 96. BUSTAMANTE, *Suplemento á Los Tres Siglos de Meixco*, §63.
43 LUMMIS, *The Awakening of a Nation.*
44 *Policy of the Catholic Church in Mexico*, 1925, p. 3.

tions demanding every just thing contained in Article 123 of the Constitution of of Queretaro and even went further than this Article in the protection of working-men's rights.[45].

It would not be hard, but for the limitations of space, to enlarge on the story of the effort of the Church along social lines to better the condition of the people; and, at the same time, to insist that the Catholics of Mexico have never failed to contribute their best to all the demands made on them for intelligent, patriotic action.

The charge that comes easiest to the tongue or pen of the Mexican politician is that the Church interfered in politics. The answer is even easier to give than the charge was to make, for no one ever tries to offer proofs that it is true. It is taken for granted that it will be believed without proofs. When and how was the Mexican Church in politics? If the charge refers to Spanish times, it is true that men like Bishop Las Casas, to whose memory revolutionary Mexico has recently erected a public monument, were in "politics" to the extent of fighting the Spanish officials in the colony, even to the foot of the throne of the King, to secure justice and education for the Indian. It is true also to the extent that, because of a none too ideal union of Church and State in those times, the latter often went beyond its rights granted under the Concordat, to encroach upon those of the Church, and was for that rebuked and opposed. It is true again to the extent that individuals sometimes sought to use the union for their own self-aggrandizement. It is true in no other way.

If the charge refers to the early revolutionary times, it is true to the extent that priests led the fight against Spain, but that the Church condemned them for deserting their spiritual activities to mix in the only kind of politics men then understood—warfare.[46] It is true to the extent that the Bishops tried to preserve religious rights against the assaults of the revolutionists of the day. It is true in no other way.

If the charge refers to more recent revolutionary history, it is true that the Church is the only defender the country could find against assaults by communists and atheists on civil, political and religious liberties. It is not true that the Church engaged in merely partisan politics. The Catholic Party of Madero's day was a party of laymen organized to win for Mexico by constitutional means a more just and equitable code of laws. Madero welcomed it as "the first fruits of my revolution." To this extent, and not to any other, Catholics, not the Church, were in politics. What of it? Does not the democratic state proclaim the legitimacy of constitutional methods to redress grievances? If that method is wrong, then we Americans do not understand democracy. And if these grievances, by the deed of the enemies of religion, lie in the realm of religious rights,

---

45 *Policy of the Catholic Church in Mexico*, 1925, pp. 4-5-6-7-8.

46 One hundred and fifty-five clergymen are listed in *Através de los Siglos*, v. 3, p. 775, as taking an active part in the revolution of 1810-21.

Hildalgo and his followers were condemned in proclamation issued by Bishop-elect of Michoacan, ABAD Y QUEIPO, Sept. 24, 1810. *Colección Dávalos*, v. 2, Doc. 44.

are the friends of religion forbidden by that fact to work for their redress, because by so doing they would be mixing in politics?

The statement of the Government of Mexico that it is now only trying to dissolve a union between Church and State, and that the Church is seeking temporal power, finds an obvious answer in the history of the Mexican nation. There has been no union of Church and State in Mexico since 1857. Even before that, however, when in 1821, a revolutionary Mexican Government desired to retain some part of the union in the ancient right of "patronage," formerly enjoyed by the Spanish Crown, so as to have the appointment of bishops in its hands, it was met with a refusal from the Archbishop of Mexico. When the demand was made the following year it was again rejected, this time by the whole body of the Episcopate.[47]

The Constitution of 1857 declared the union of Church and State to be dissolved.[48] That instrument, however, recognized the Church as a legal, though separate entity. According to the "liberal" doctrine then in vogue, no "legal person" was such by its own inherent right, and became so only by grant of the state, which by a legal fiction created it. What the State makes, however, it can unmake, and this the Constitution of 1917, by a logical conclusion from a false premise, attempted to do. It recognizes[49] "no juridical personality in the religious institutions known as churches," thus depriving them of any legal protection against the encroachments of tyrants, whose real and often expressed purpose in Mexico was and is, not to separate the Church from the State but to subject the Church to the control of the State.[50] The Church in Mexico, on the other hand, is not asking for the union of Church and State to be restored, but for the American system of freedom of religion to be introduced. This may easily be learned from the words[51] of the Mexican Bishops addressed to the legislature: "What is it that we petition? Not tolerance, not complacency, much less privileges or favors. We demand liberty and we demand nothing but liberty, we demand liberty for all religions. . . . A regime of restrictions against religion is the denial of liberty."

Equal in falsehood with the slander against the Church in reference to education and wealth is that concerning extortion on the part of the Mexican clergy.[52]

---

47 *Concilio III Mexicano*, p. 569.

Succeeding governments attempted to arrange for, or to assert, the right to appoint the Bishops and priests, until in 1857 when the constitution declared the separation of Church and State and the policy of expropriation was adopted.

48 Art. 3.

49 Art. 130.

50 Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 1.

51 Sept. 7, 1926.

52 The Indians were exempt from the payment of the tithing during the colonial period. (ALAMAN, v. 1, p. 23.) On the other classes only the tithing and first friuts were obligatory, anything else being voluntary. (*Concilio III Mexicano* Lib. III. Tit. XII, § III.) The fees which the parish priests were permitted to receive were fixed; those accepting more were fined double the excess. Marriages in the parish church occasioned no offering. The customary offering for baptism was one peso. Burials five to twelve pesos. For Indians the customary offerings were one-half those expected from the Spaniards. (*Arancel*, 1767.)

Those who have seen the poverty in which the clergy of our generation have lived need no proof drawn from statistics to know that they have been slandered. It suffices to say for those of other days that the total offerings collected in the churches by the Mexican clergy never represented a donation of even as much as one peso from each member of the flock per year. Offerings on the occasions of baptisms and marriages are smaller than those made to clergymen in the United States.[53] Works of education and charity have been supported chiefly by those whose means enabled them to be generous, as in our own country. The poor paid nothing but the copper dropped into a collection basket on Sunday. In Spanish times it is quite true that the revenues of the bishops were often large,[54] but it is also quite true to say that the surplus was spent on the great institutions to which we have already referred. Indeed, the building of hospitals and orphanages seems to have been the favorite work of many bishops, who paid for them out of the revenues not needed for the support of their households and the cost of managing their large dioceses.[55] The hospitals in particular were the best that the times know and superior to those of Europe. Some of those still standing are considered models for such a climate as that of Mexico, even at this day. Notable amongst such wonderful buildings is one in Guadalajara which is still visited by physicians, even from the United States, to study its construction and its plans for the care of patients; yet it is three centuries old and the gift of a bishop. Where the revenue of Bishop Zumárraga went is indicated by one of his letters[56] to the King of Spain written in 1537: "That which occupies my thoughts, to which my will is most inclined and my small forces strive, is that in this city and in every diocese there shall be a college for Indian

---

53 The *Churchman*, a Protestant Episcopal publication, in an editorial, February 6, 1915, quoted William Watson (a non-Catholic, who had lived some eight years in Puebla, Oaxaca, Guadalajara, and Mexico), on offerings as follows: Baptisms, 33 to 69 cents; marriages, $2.50 to $3.00; and nothing for baptisms and marriages during missions.

54 HUMBOLDT *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*, New York, 1811, v. 1, p. 173, gives the revenues of the Bishops as follows: Mexico, 130,000 double piastres (evidently pesos or dollars); Puebla, 110,000; Valladolid 100,000; Guadalajara 90,000; Durango 35,000; Monterey 30,000; Yucatan 20,000; Oaxaca 18,000, Sonora 6,000, the last from the government treasury.

The tithing for the twenty year period 1771-1789 averaged $1,584,048.90 per year according to a tabluation given by HUMBOLDT *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*, 1822 edition, v. 3, p. 96. The tithing was divided as follows; one-fourth to the Bishop; one-fourth to the Cathedral Chapter; the remaining half was divided into nine parts, of which two-ninths went to the King, three-ninths to the cathedral building fund and hospital, and four-ninths to the parish priests. (*Recopilación de Indias*, Lib. I, Tit. XVI, Ley XXIII.)

55 It was customary for the Bishops to devote any surplus to works of public benefit. This accounts for the numerous schools and hospitals founded by them. The San Andres hospital is an example. It was founded in 1779, by Archbishop Haro, who secured the building, which had been a Jesuit college, from the government. He equipped it with 400 beds, all endowed. By February 1790, his donations had totaled $459,586. The hospital's funds amounted to $1,454,657. Some of the properties belonging to it appear in the list of the confiscated properties referred to in note 40.

56 ZUMÁRRAGA: *Estudio Biografico.* GARCIA ICAZBALCETA, p. 215.

boys learning grammar at least, and a great establishment with room for a large number of the daughters of the Indians. "Before his death the Bishop had seen to it that a goodly part of his wish was made a reality. Nor should we pass without attention the letter of Geronimo Lopez to the King in which, as early as 1541, he complained against the Church because her clergy had taught the Indians too faithfully, even to the point of making them excellent writers and expert latinists."[57]

It must be remembered that the Bishops were the responsible trustees of funds for works other than those of the parishes and missions. In their zeal for progress, however, they often went far afield to make Mexico a progressive nation, for we find them building public roads and even aqueducts.[58] If the poor of Mexico have been systematically robbed by the extortion of their clergy, surely it will be hard to explain a devotion on their part to the Church and to their pastors which not even rigid censorship succeeds in concealing from those who to-day read what is happening in Mexico.

Even Catholics have asked why the Church in Mexico does not use its undoubted power to bring this persecution to a speedy end and take measures to prevent its recurrence, since it is admitted that the overwhelming majority of the Mexican people are of its fold. They forget that there are but two human means to that end: the ballot and the sword. The first is hopeless in Mexico, because there the ballot is not respected and governments are unaffected by it. Few citizens use it, because their votes are counted only when they favor the ruling powers or when these powers, for effect or deception, are willing to admit the existence of a small minority. An outstanding proof of this is found in the rejection, by a vote of every member save one, of the petition for relief addressed by the Mexican Bishops to the Congress, though the petition was supported by the people. Congress, Senate and Courts do the bidding of the President; and this condition has been the rule and not the exception since "Liberty" came to Mexico by force of arms. It will continue to be the rule while that kind of "Liberty" stays. Ballots are less powerful than bullets when they are the playthings of tyranny.

The second human remedy is equally hopeless, for Christian principles forbid the Church founded by the Prince of Peace to take up the sword or rely upon such carnal weapons as the inflamed passions of men would select. If the Church has learned many things in her life of two thousand years the principal lesson came from the patience of her Divine Founder. She is not fated to die, but she has learned how to suffer. With Him she will be crucified but with Him also she will rise. The weapons of men are not for her. But, if these human weapons the Church will not use, she has one that well fits her hand, armored as it is in justice and in truth. She has prayer. Never in the history of the trials of the Church in Mexico has that weapon been so firmly held as now, thanks to the paternal counsels of the Sovereign Pontiff. Because of these, no longer does the

57 *Colección de Documentos para la Historia de Mexico.* GARCIA ICAZBALCETA, v. 1, p. 148.

58 Aqueduct at Durango 1728. *Gaceta* of April, 1728.
Aqueduct at Valladolid (Morelia) 1788. *Bol.* etc. 3a. Ep. v. 1, p. 627.

quivering voice of the afflicted Church of Mexico rise alone to the Comforter. From end to end of the earth the answer to the appeal of Pius goes upward to the throne of God. The hatred of men may spurn it. The malice of men may curse it. The unbelief of men may mock it. But its hope is in a Promise and its power is in a Faith.

What, therefore, we have written is no call on the faithful here or elsewhere to purely human action. It is no interposition of our influence either as Bishops or as citizens to reach those who possess political power anywhere on earth, and least of all in our own country, to the end that they should intervene with armed force in the internal affairs of Mexico for the protection of the Church. Our duty is done when, by telling the story, defending the truth and emphasizing the principles, we sound a warning to Christian civilization that its foundations are again being attacked and undermined. For the rest, God will bring His will to pass in His own good time and in His own good way. Mexico will be saved for her mission whatever it may be. That this mission is now to give a great example of Christian patience and to demonstrate the force of faith undaunted, we may well believe. For the future we may take confidence from the examples of other nations that went through the same fiery furnace of persecution and emerged, triumphantly prepared for great things. The Mexican nation once proved its inherent worth by its rapid advancement in Christian civilization. For the days of De Gante and Zumárraga, Las Casas and Motolinia, as well as those of Junipero Serra, who carried the work of the missionaries into what is now our own land, Mexico has no need to offer apology.

For the sad days of decline, the Church, forbidden by law to teach and robbed of the means to carry on her mission of enlightenment, has only to show her chains, and say to her enemies: "You blame me for poverty, yet you took from me the endowments for my hospitals, my orphanages, my countless works of mercy. You blame me for ignorance, yet you closed my schools, and stole my colleges, the first to light the torch of learning on this continent. You say that I have added nothing to science and art, but you destroyed the art I brought with me and developed, burned my books and scattered the results of my labor for science to the four winds of heaven. You blame me for lawlessness, yet you destroyed my missions among a peaceful and thriving Indian population, and gave to them, in place of Christ's Gospel, the thirty pieces of silver with which you bribed them to murder their fellows. You took the cross out of their hands to replace it with a torch and a gun. Show me one good thing in Mexico I did not give you. Show me one genius for whom I was not responsible. Show me one step toward the light that I did not help you to make. Take out of your country all that I put in it, and see what remains. You may thrust me out, exile my bishops, murder my priests, again steal my schools and desecrate my sanctuaries, but you can not blot out history, you can not erase the mark I made on you—not in a century of centuries."

If the gaining of the whole world does not recompense the individual for the loss of his soul, what then shall it profit a nation? There was a soul in Mexico, a spirit manifesting its presence by the impulse that sent her missionaries of civilization along a way unmarked, save for the print of their sandals, but now

the great Royal Road of California—the Camino Real. It was a spirit that, building on its faith and its inspiration, left monuments to tell Mexico's story in the old missions of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and along the shores of the Pacific from San Diego to San Francisco. For us of the North, these buildings, landmarks of the first Christian missions within our borders, beacons of the light of religion and civilization on our soil, fonts and fertile sources of a distinctive literature touched and tinted with colors and values all its own, are treasures honored as a rich legacy, noble and ennobling. The old records speak in the Spanish tongue to tell us that it was not really Spain but Mexico that sent the Padres to the North. Their Castilian speech is passing; nor are there left many descendants of the brave souls that came with them to write the first chapter, the chapter of beauty, into the history of our California. But the memories are not dead, nor has the trail been lost that was marked by the discoverers who gave to the Far Western country the first martyrs as well as the first teachers in all our nation. Through them we share in the glory of the initial gesture of Christian civilization on this continent. We have not denied, nor shall we deny, our debt to Mexico for this. Already it has been acknowledged by voices which, if they do not all sing the old hymns, yet do all understand something of the message of the singers; if they do not all worship at the old altars, yet do all hold sacred the spots upon which the Padres built them, and give to the new cities that grew around them the old names, to keep for the great West its traditions, its character and its charm. If the mother should forget what the sons and daughters love, shall not these sons and daughters take shame instead of glory from her? For you of our own flock in this happy land, where the rights of conscience are recognized and upheld by the laws, and respected by the people, we re-echo the appeal of Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI., and ask the charity of your prayers—a memento in the daily masses of the priests, and a remembrance in the daily devotions of the faithful—for your afflicted brethren in Mexico, recalling to you words of Our Lord to show that your practical sympathy thus expressed will be pleasing in His sight: *"Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice sake: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven."*[59]

To the Bishops, the Clergy and the Faithful of Mexico we inscribe this defense of their history and their rights, not alone as a duty to the faith we hold in common, but as a testimony to their fortitude under trial and to the justice they preach in their dignified and legitimate demands. We bid them be of good cheer, for to Mexico in affliction may the significant words of the Master of the Apostle of the Gentiles be once more applied: *"This man is to me a vessel of election, to carry My name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Israel. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for My name's sake."*[60]

Given, this Twelfth Day of December, in the Year of our Lord, MCMXXVI, Feast of our Lady of Guadalupe.

---

59 *Matthew* v. 10.
60 *Acts* iv, 15-16.

NECROLOGY

MOST REV. DENIS JOSEPH O'CONNELL, D. D.

The Most Rev. Denis Joseph O'Connell, former Bishop of Richmond, titular Archbishop of Mariamme, Syria, died at the Episcopal residence, Richmond in January. He was in his seventy-seventh year. For almost two years he had been in failing health and about a year before his death he had asked to be relieved of his duties as head of the see of Richmond. His request was granted by the Holy Father, who immediately raised Bishop O'Connell to the titular Archbishopric of Mariamme. He served as administrator of the Richmond diocese, however, until the installation of his successor, Bishop Brennan.

The funeral services were held on January 5. Most Rev. Peter Fumasoni-Biondi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, pontificated at the Solemn Requiem Mass in the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart at 10 o'clock. The sermon was preached by Bishop Howard of Covington, Ky.

One of the most distinguished members of the American Hierarchy, Archbishop O'Connell was a fluent linguist, a close student of literature and the arts. He was a member of the Virginia Art Commission.

Born in Donoughmore County, Cork, Ireland, Jan. 25, 1849, Archbishop O'Connell was brought to America during infancy by his parents, who settled in Columbia, S. C. He received his early training in the public and private schools of that city. Later he attended St. Charles' College, at Ellicott City, Md., and St. Mary's College, Baltimore. He completed his theological studies at the American college at Rome, where he was ordained May 26, 1877, and received the degree of doctor of sacred theology. During the same year he was made assistant at St. Peter's Church, this city.

In 1884 the young priest was made secretary to Cardinal Gibbons at the third plenary council of Baltimore, and was designated to carry the decrees of the council to Rome. The same year he was made rector of the American College at Rome, and in 1887 he was chosen a domestic prelate, giving him the title of Monsignor. In 1895 he resigned the rectorate of the American College at Rome to become vicar to Cardinal Gibbons for his titular church of Santa Maria in Trastevere, Rome.

In 1903 Archbishop O'Connell was appointed rector of the Catholic University of America, where he served until 1909, when he was appointed auxiliary bishop of San Francisco, having on May 3, 1908, been consecrated titular bishop of Sebaste. He served as auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of San Francisco from March, 1909, to January, 1912, when he was transferred to Richmond as successor to Bishop Augustine Van de Vyver.

Numerous tributes to his memory came from members of the hierarchy, from the Catholic University of America and from the secular press.

Archbishop Curley, addressing an immense audience in the Baltimore Cathedral on the day following Archbishop O'Connell's death, said: "Archbishop O'Connell was one of the most cultured and learned members of the hierarchy, and at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore was one of the council's most brilliant theologians. He was a scholarly man and a kind man and in a rare

degree inspired the love and respect of those outside as well as those within his faith. All men recognized in him a true friend."

Bishop Shahan, Rector of the Catholic University of America, wrote in the *Baltimore Catholic Review:*

From the beginning of his ecclesiastical career, Bishop O'Connell easily stood first among the youths of his time at the American College, Rome, because of his extraordinary natural gifts. To this day, the memory of his great ability and many successes still lingers there. Cardinal Gibbons at once recognized in him a young priest of great promise and made constant use of the advantages with which a Roman training had endowed him. Though one of the youngest of the American clergy, he took no inconsiderable part in the preparation and execution of the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. His knowledge of ecclesiastical Rome, together with his tact and courtesy, made it possible for him to render great service to the American Catholic Church while it was yet under propaganda. Later, as Rector of the American College, he took a fatherly interest in the numerous ecclesiastics who came under his direction. He provided generously for their comfort, and was never sparing of helpful advice and good counsel.

Not a few of the American clergy educated at Rome retain a pleasant remembrance of the services rendered them by Bishop O'Connell. He was at home in the American colony at Rome, and endeared himself to the many visitors, Catholic and non-Catholic, who were attracted to the Eternal City in ever-increasing numbers. By the Congregation of Propaganda, he was always esteemed for his knowledge of American ecclesiastical conditions. The American bishops and religious institutions of his time made constant demands upon his good will and influence.

As rector of the Catholic University at Washington, he guided it with success through a period of extraordinary trials and difficulties. Had conditions and circumstances been more favorable, he would have been able, undoubtedly, to accomplish much more.

His career as Bishop of Richmond is known to all. He neglected none of the interests of our holy religion, and furthered them as far as his means permitted. He soon won the respect and esteem not only of his own people, but of the entire non-Catholic community. They were quick to see in him, not alone the representative of Catholic faith and discipline, but also a gentleman, a ripe scholar and a patriotic citizen, ever ready to do his part in the development of the community and the State. In his long and eventful life he was ever faithful to the highest ideals of the Catholic faith, and showed a rare insight into the conditions, civil and ecclesiastical, of a period of transition. Few ecclesiastics had a larger host of admiring and trustful friends.

His tastes were highly intellectual, and he always kept in close touch with the great modern currents of thought in their relations to traditional Catholic faith. Had he confined himself to ecclesiastical scholarship he would probably have left valuable memories of his extensive erudition and his clear insight into the fundamentals of faith and religion. His discourse was always logical, forcible and

direct, with the peculiar acument and lucidity of a mind fed on the teachings of the schools.

The memory of Bishop O'Connell will long remain with us as that of a courageous and chivalrous son of the Southland, and the last link that connected the present time with the order of Catholic life and thought that followed the Civil War, and in which American Catholicism for the first time appeared in its true colors to the citizens of the United States.

The Baltimore *Sun* had the following editorial:

The death of Bishop Denis J. O'Connell removes another of the deservedly popular figures that stood in the front rank of Catholicism in this country in the days of Cardinal Gibbons. A native of Ireland, but early brought to this country and educated here until his studies called him to Rome, there were many common interests between him and the Cardinal, and in due course he became the latter's secretary. The friendship must have been very deep and warm, for, years later, after fame had come to Bishop O'Connell, he was to be seen in the happy little group that surrounded Cardinal Gibbons when he repaired for rest and meditation to the home of the Shrivers in the cool hills of Carroll.

And a handsome, charming figure he made against that quiet, kindly background. He knew his Europe and he knew his America; among the great on both sides of the ocean were his friends, particularly leaders in the Roosevelt and Taft Administrations, for during his service with the Catholic University in Washington he was one of the personages of the capital. Yet all of the learning and graces that were the fruits of his cosmopolitan life were made to do service, in the sweet simplicity of rural life, to delightful little gayeties in conversation that somehow blended beautifully with the fine gravity that attended the Cardinal. A rare and captivating man. His memory will linger.

The Richmond *News Leader*, also in an editorial, paid this splendid tribute to the deceased prelate:

It was not as the titular archbishop of Mariamme, but as the Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Richmond, that the late Denis J. O'Connell was known and loved.

No words were oftener on his lips than "Christian charity," and no actions were more spontaneous in his life than those which that phrase exemplified. Radiating sympathy and affection, walking in a simplicity that took no thought of self, consecrated to the supreme task of making real that daily repeated petition, "Thy kingdom come," Bishop O'Connell made no distinction between creed or caste, if haply any might be helped or succoured.

Calling once on a Protestant friend in great sorrow over the loss of a very dear relative, Bishop O'Connell said: "I have come as a fellow-mortal holding out a hand of sympathy and affection, and I know you will believe me when I tell you, not as a professional, but out of my own experience, that there are no two things in this world as real as faith and prayer."

It was the all-embracing heart of Bishop O'Connell that made him loved because he first loved others. His love of Christian charity was an active,

moving force for harmony between individuals, classes and denominations, and by that spirit he did more to free Richmond from intolerant hatreds and miserable misunderstandings than could have been accomplished in an eternity of theological argument. And so he emphasized again the truth that "All the theologians differ, but all the saints agree."

To have been head of the American College in Rome and of the Rector of the Catholic University of America would be honor and fame enough for most men, yet if this article appraises Bishop O'Connell's aims and achievements with even an approximation of understanding, it would not be to honors and titles and place and prestige that the bishop would turn his eyes at the end. His sense of ultimate values, in the opinion of the News Leader, was far otherwise. It was not the narrow limit of personal recognition that enlisted his efforts and inspired his ambitions. His field of labor was the illimitable circle of all that he could serve or help or reach. He may never have phrased or even thought of his work in terms of its relationship to his position in his own church, or the world outside, and yet death, the revealer, has shown again in the end of the good and faithful servant, that "the world passeth away, and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."

To have left an abiding memory of Christian charity in the hearts of the people of a great city is to have gained an immeasureable reward, and that blessing has come back to the bishop that is mourned today.

His knowledge was of the solidest. Trained in schools where "shortcuts" were counted dishonest, he was equipped to seek truth in the language in which savants had written it. His mastery of languages was extraordinary. It was his custom, when traveling, to carry a small Hebrew Bible with him, and from its unpointed text, without lexicon, he would read for hours, as a combined spiritual and mental exercise. He knew his Greek as well as his Hebrew, and his Latin, of course. He spoke readily every language of Western Europe, except, perhaps, Dutch, and he must have read altogether at least a dozen.

One would have know from anything he said, or from any data he ever supplied for publication that he had held the two most important educational posts that an American Catholic can occupy, or that the bishopric was a reward for his great achievements as Rector of the Catholic University.

Bishop O'Connell's years in Rome were among those made forever memorable in archaeology by the excavations of Giacomo Boni in the Forum Romanum. It was the time, also, when many ancient sites in and near the city were yielding up the treasures that now crowd the National Museum in the Baths of Diocletian. Father O'Connell came under the spell of classic art and developed a real flair for archaeology. He acquired an interest that deepened and widened to the last. No sphere of archaeology was alien to him. He knew, for example, as much about the Hittite inscriptions as did almost any professional archaeologist in the United States.

He wrote little, for his hours were crowded with clerical duties, but he possessed amazing lore. And this exceptional knowledge, it should be remembered, was the possession of a man reared in South Carolina, and schooled in that state during those dreary, difficult years that followed the war between the States.

His scholarship, in short, was American and so was his point of view, though both were enriched, as every man's should be, by travel and foreign contacts. There was never a question where Bishop O'Connell stood toward his country or toward the advancement of truth. He was for America at all times, and for the truth wherever it was to be found.

His ministerial labor, his civic service, his scholarship and his patriotism were all illumined by the power of his personality and by the warmth of his affection. In any company he was distinguished, and before illness marred him, he was physically magnificent and unforgetably impressive in bearing. The greatest scholars could listen to him with profit, and the humblest could turn to him with confidence and reverence. He won, as he merited, much happiness because he had discovered that secret of living and of knowing, also. But even more of happiness was his because, before living and knowing, he put love of his fellowman.

CHRONICLE

French Royalists have fallen upon evil days. Strutting in borrowed plumes for a long period, they are now writhing under condemnation of their official organ the *Action Française*, by the Holy See. The writings of Léon Daudet, the editor, and of his collaborator, Charles Maurras, have been designated particularly for avoidance by Catholic readers. The action of the Holy Father in issuing this prohibition was a sequel to the attitude of Cardinal Andrieux and repeated warnings issued or approved of by the Holy See as to the danger, especially for Catholic youth in absorbing the teachings of Daudet and Maurras on political science.

Cardinal Dubois, Archbishop of Paris recently issued a lengthy Pastoral on the *Action Française* in which is incorporated a large part of the Sovereign Pontiff's Allocution.

Unhappily the followers of MM. Daudet and Maurras are duping themselves with the fable that Pope Pius XI is "the victim of a Briand plot which has misled him into condemning an organization obnoxious to the managers of the Third Republic." The Cardinal explicitly denounces this ingenious excuse. Expounding the thought of the Holy Father, he says:

> Il rejette une doctrine politique où les droits de Dieu et ceux de l'Eglise ne sont pas d'abord et suffisamment respectés; il blâme, comme contraire à la morale catholique, une méthode d'action politique où sont déclarés bons tous les moyens d'aboutir; il écarte comme inacceptable la maxime "Politique d'abord," car la politique ne saurait être, aux yeux des catholiques, le premier moyen de restauration religieuse; la prière, les œuvres, l'apostolat priment celui-là. Il en est d'autres, d'un ordre moins élevé, efficaces eux aussi, comme les organisations civiques, les manifestations populaires, etc., où s'affirme "l'union des volontés," et que le Pape lui-même recommande instamment dans son allocution.

Regarding the fatuous suggestion that the future of the Catholic Church in France is bound up with a restoration of the Monarchy, he says:

> L'Eglise de France sait ce qu'elle doit à la monarchie française; elle sait aussi ce qu'elle pourrait en espérer; est-ce une raison pour nier tout espoir de relèvement et de progrès religieux sous une autre forme de gouvernement? L'Eglise enseigne que sa vie est indépendante des constitutions politiques; et de cette doctrine l'histoire—ancienne et moderne—atteste la vérité.

The Pastoral concludes by adjuring all Catholics who have been deceived (or are deceiving themselves) through the Briand plot story to face the facts and to do their duty.

The Rome correspondent of the *Tablet* (London) supplies the following important adjunct to the above statements:

To Cardinal Andrieu, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who brought to a head last autumn the problem of MM. Maurras and Daudet, the Sovereign Pontiff has addressed an important letter, which must be linked with the Allocution of December 20. Since addressing the Cardinals on that date, His Holiness has caused a thorough search to be made among what may be called the departmental memoranda of the Holy See. The Pontiff, alluding to his long connection with the Ambrosian Library at Milan, says "the habits of a life largely passed among books and documents suggested to Us clues by which these papers have been found." To the general public it may seem strange that Vatican papers are less readily accessible than those of ordinary firms and institutions; but it must be remembered that, in the darkest year of the Great War, the sacred Congregation of the Index was incorporated by Pope Benedict XV with the Holy Office, and that the work of classifying the united archives is in arrears. Not until after the Consistory of December 20 last, when Pope Pius XI condemned the *Action Française*, were the documents found which His Holiness has just communicated to Cardinal Andrieu. Briefly, their tenor is as follows:. In January, 1914, the Congregation of the Index examined the works of M. Maurras and unanimously found four of them "truly bad." Many persons, however, spoke up for M. Maurras [it has already been reported in *The Tablet* that this author, like M. Daudet, had written culpable books in youth, but professed to regret them], and therefore Pius X did not promulgate the Decree putting the books on the Index but kept it in being, to be used if necessity should arise. Under Pope Benedict XV (on April 14, 1915) the Decree was again mentioned; but the Pontiff decided that the War, then in its first year, had created a situation in which political passions must not be further inflamed, and the Decree was again held back. Under the Sovereign Pontiff now happily reigning everything has been done to keep MM. Maurras and Daudet and their organization on tolerable lines; but these two chiefs of the A. F. have preferred to affront the Pope in a dozen ways, from the recommending of Voltaire's works to the inciting of Catholics to disobey the Holy Father. Therefore, Pope Pius XI has done what he would have done a month ago if a full dossier had been in his hands before he delivered his Allocution. That is to say, His Holiness has at last promulgated the Decree of Pius X. To emphasize the accord of the two Pontiffs this Decree now bears two dates—January 29, 1914, and December 29, 1926.

By the above-mentioned Decree, the Pope puts into force the sentence of Pius X against several books of M. Maurras and against the fortnightly edition of the *Action Française;* and he explicitly extends the condemnation to the daily newspaper of the same name. It is necessary to repeat that the leniency shown for so long to the paper and its directors was due to the fact that they certainly worked hard for the rights of Catholics and that their enthusiasm on behalf of the Church was accepted as proof that they repented of their anti-Christian and immoral writings. Events indicate that they have not changed their spots;

and so the faithful are warned against them. But it is fair to add that M. Maurras has never professed to be a Catholic.

The *Action Française* is now on the Index; and four books by M. Maurras have been likewise proscribed: *Le Chemin de Paradis, Anthinea, Les Amants de Venise* and *Trois Idées Politiques.*

Notre Dame University has completed an amalgamation of all its activities devoted to the dramatic and allied arts into a novel organization known as the University Theatre.

This organization already has made progress toward co-ordinating all campus work of a theatre character. Plays written in the play-writing courses of the University are staged by those who have studied this craft, in the University's own theatre, which seats 800.

Everything is the product of the University itself. In this manner a play laboratory is being created where the most practical side of the theatre as well as the theoretical receives consideration. It may well be that the movement eventually will have an influence on the stage throughout the country.

At the same time it is proposed to develop a Catholic Play Information Service, through the University Theatre, which will assume national scope. This service will supply parishes, sodalities, etc., with information concerning plays and their production, and thus is calculated to become a boon to Catholic theatrical production everywhere.

The chair in l'Academie Française, left vacant by the death of M. Maurice Barrès, is now occupied by another Catholic writer, M. Louis Bertrand.

M. Bertrand is the author of books on St. Augustine, St. Teresa, and French Africa. In 1918 he published *Sanguinis Martyrum,* and is a frequent contributor to the *Revue des Deux Mondes, Revue des Jeunes,* one of the leading Catholic periodicals of France, the *Figaro, Revue de Paris,* and the *Echo de Paris.*

A large silver medal, struck by special order of the Pope, was presented by Cardinal Gasparri on December 31 to Cardinal Gasquet.

The medal commemorates the historic event of the presentation to the Sovereign Pontiff by the Benedictine Cardinal and his collaborators of the Book of Genesis, the first fruits of the Revision of the Vulgate, entrusted to the Benedictine Order under the presidency of His Eminence.

The Cardinal Secretary of State went to Cardinal Gasquet's residence, the Palazzo San Callisto, to present the medal. On the front are represented the Cardinal in the act of presenting, and the Pope of receiving the volume.

On the reverse is the following inscription:

Pio XI. P. M.
Quam divinorum librorum
Vulgatam latinam editionem.
Patres concilii tridentini

ad codicum fidem
emendatissime fore decrevere
eamque Pontifices Romani
in aedibus S. Calixti perficiendam curarunt.
S. Benedicti alumni ad tantum opus vocati
praeside Aidano Card. Gasquet, O. S. B.
inaugurantes
librum Geneseos
devoti grati offerunt.

In connection with the celebration of the thirteen hundredth anniversary of the Cathedral of St. Peter at York, more commonly known as the Minster, the *Universe* says:

The first church is mentioned by the Venerable Bede himself. He relates that King Edwin of Northumbria was baptised a Christian, "with his nobles and his people" at York at Easter in A. D. 627. Shortly afterwards he provided Paulinus with a see in the same city, and forthwith built a wooden church over the spot where he was baptised. Later he commenced the building of a stone church. On New Year's Eve the Church of England, in the persons of the Archbishop of York and other dignitaries, celebrated with elaborate ritual, this centenary of the "Cathedral and Metropolitical Church of St. Peter at York." How they reconciled this ritual with their own teachings on such things is a matter for their own conscience. What it is well to remember is that St. Paulinus was sent by Pope Gregory to help St. Augustine. In other words, a direct successor of St. Peter was the primary instrument in the founding of York Minster; and each of the three saints mentioned were members of the Order of St. Benedict.

Recent excavations by English archaeologists at the site of the Roman town of Uriconium in a Shropshire village have revealed the largest Roman building yet uncovered in Britain.

A shattered tablet found near the entrance, when pieced together, revealed the place was the forum or market place erected by the Emperor Hadrian in A. D. 130.

Numerous other buildings have been unearthed, and all show indications that the city of Uriconium was destroyed by fire. The bricks of the ancient walls are so blackened and charred that they look as if the conflagration might have occurred recently instead of hundreds of years ago.

Several ancient skeletons have been found, one of these, that of a man, was discovered in a "hypocaust" or heating chamber for a bath. In his hand was a broken box which once contained the coins which were scattered around him. These coins bore the date A. D. 111.

Footmarks of Roman sandals can be seen in the soft cement and wellheads scored by the lowering of a rope. A steel covered spur of a fighting cock, a

surgeon's lancet and many other discoveries give indication that life in Roman days had many aspects similar to that of to-day.

A rare book, a Latin translation of the collected medical and philosophical works of Isaac Israeli, a physician of the Middle Ages, has been donated to the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, through the efforts of Mr. Mortimer L. Schiff. One edition was printed at Lyons in 1515: the copy in question was secured at an action in Berlin.

Other valuable gifts presented to the institution by Mr. Schiff are three Latin incunabula. Of one of these there is not a single copy extant in the United States, nor are there any copies in the British Museum or the Bodleian libraries. This is an extremely rare volume of legal opinions of de Laudo, a prominent lawyer practicing in Rome in 1478, and has several chapters regarding the treatment accorded the Jews of Italy by the Church and the State during that period.

Another incunabulum is the work of of St. Ambrose, printed in Basle, 1492, by Johannes Amerbach. It is in three volumes, containing commentaries on various portions of the Bible.

The third incunabulum is a collection of sermons by Bernardinus de Bustis, entitled *Rosarium Sermonum*, printed in Venice 1498. Among them is included a sermon directed against "the iniquitous and obstinate sect of the Jews." It is followed by a "consilium" (legal opinion) rendered by him for the Duke of Milan against the Jews who were charged with blasphemies against Jesus and Mary.

The N. C. W. C. Cable Service (November 17) announces the return from Syria to Jerusalem of the Dominican Fathers Carrière and Barrois of the French Biblical and Archaelogical School, who had been engaged in important excavations in the region of Neirab, near Aleppo.

They have succeeded in making several very interesting finds. They unearthed a rich necropolis, a large number of little statues of terra cotta and bronze, pottery, jewels and arms of all kinds. These objects make it possible to follow the evolution of the numerous civilizations which have succeeded each other since the first Assyrian dominations until the Hellenic period in Aell-Neirab.

But the most valuable discovery consists of 27 tablets of cuneiform writing and three Egyptian scarabees which very probably were part of the funeral equipment of a tomb. The excavations will be resumed again by the learned Dominican Fathers next spring.

The city of Budapest has erected on the main square of the city a statue to an unknown monk who was Hungary's first historian. Author of a most valuable work entitled *Gesta Hungarorum*, this monk was mentioned by the great king Bela II, who reigned from 1131 to 1141, but nothing else is known of him except that his name began with the letter P and that he studied in Paris.

The statue is a most curious one. It shows the monk seated on a stone bench with his hood drawn down over his face, in such a way that his features are suggested but not distinguishable, thus preserving the anonymity of him who made the first contribution to the history of his country but whose name has been lost forever.

An Associated Press item (January 8) says: Codfish and not the riches of India was the inspiration that led to the discovery of America, and it wasn't Christopher Columbus, but a Frenchman who made the discovery, anyway, says the well known French writer, Leon Sazie.

The desire of the people along the Basque coast, Sazie says in an article published in Paris, to eat codfish, not only on Fridays but on most of the other days of the week, led to America's discovery.

Any one at all conversant with history, he says, knows that the people of Spain and the French Basques got into the habit of eating codfish long before 1492 and the place where the fishermen went to fetch their favorite food was off the Newfoundland banks.

"The wealth of India myth as a determining factor in the discovery of America is exploded," the writer says. In fact, he continues, it was these Basque fishermen who first took Columbus across the ocean, having crossed it themselves long before.

The next startling theory advanced by M. Sazie is how the Navajo Indians got their name. There were a lot of people, the theory runs, from Navarre and Gascony on the Newfoundland fishing trips and what could be more natural than that the Navajo Indians got their names from the Frenchmen who hobnobbed with the North American Indians long before Columbus was born.

Hardy Basque fishermen, in fact, Sazie says, knew their way around the world long before Magellan made his famous voyage of circumnavigation. As proof he cites various names borne by members of the Japanese aristocracy, which he says are Basque in origin, with the added assertion that there are many Basque and Gascon words and modes of expression in the Japanese language.

During the Sesquicentennial celebration at Philadelphia, which closed so ingloriously in the last days of 1926 visitors had an opportunity to visit the *Lief Erickson*, a quaint Norwegian vessel of ten tons capacity which had made the voyage from Norway without mishap. The *Newfoundland Quarterly* (October 31), says:

The *Lief Erickson*, a quaint Norwegian vessel of ten tons capacity put into port at 5:30 p. m. July 13th, from Bergen via Iceland, Greenland and Labrador after a passage of 60 days. She carries a crew of four including the commander, Captain Gerhard Folgery. The *Lief Erickson* was launched last March at Hennisbergen. Her Captain informed the reporter his object was to demonstrate that the feat of Lief Erickson some 900 years ago was possible, and not only could be duplicated, but even bettered, because while his ship is of similar

construction to that in which Lief Erickson was supposed to have discovered America, she is 16 feet shorter and has a crew of four whereas the other carried a crew of 35 men. The *Lief Erickson* is clinker built, with bow and stem sharp, similar to a whale boat. She is 42 feet long, 13 feet beam, 6 feet deep, and is open decked except for about 10 feet of both ends, which are housed in as sleeping quarters. She has one mast, and carries a spreading as well as a square sail. The latter sail has red and white stripes and is for use when the ship is decorated. She is fitted with four wooden pumps, which are capable of bailing her out in two hours when all are manned. Her stem and bow are decorated with quaintly carved figure heads which can be taken apart in sections when occasion requires. The rudder is operated by a long tiller. Oars are used when the boat becomes becalmed. She carries quite a lot of equipment including a lifeboat. In addition to the crew a small dog is carried as mascot. One other object of special interest on board is a pot of house flowers in bloom.

The *Lief Erickson* after leaving Bergen called at the Faröe Islands, where a stay of three weeks was made. She then proceeded to Iceland and the next day set out for Greenland. Arriving there, safely, preparations for the third leg of the journey to Labrador were made, it being the attention to proceed through the Straits of Belle Isle, skirt the Nova Scotia Coast, and then sail on to Philadelphia. In due course the *Erickson* arrived at Labrador, but was caught in the ice floes for eight days and progress became impossible. Then storms came on and the tiny craft was badly knocked about and drifted out of her course. The Captain decided to steer for this port and had but little difficulty in coming down the coast. From here she proceeds to Philadelphia and will be exhibited.

The Rev. Dr. Romain Butin, professor of Oriental languages and director of the museum at the Catholic University of America and for three months director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, delivered a very interesting address on "Abyssinia as a Field of Archaeological Research," at the twenty-eighth general meeting of the Palestine Oriental Society, held in Jerusalem. Four other archaeologists also read papers. Among these were one on "A Katabanik Inscription," by Father Janssen, O. P., and one by Father Alexis Mallon, S. J. Father Mallon's paper dealt with "A New Phoenician Inscription in Ancient Characters."

Dr. Butin, in the course of his address, recounted important discoveries made in Abyssinia by Father Bernardin Azais, a young Capuchin of Addis Ababa.

"In his first trip in 1922," said Dr. Butin, "Father Azais went to the region of the Ogadens, southeast of Harar and west of British Somaliland. He found over sixty dolmens of the same type as those found in Europe, North Africa, Syria and as far as India. In one case a tomb was opened and found to contain besides human remains, also potsherds, a silver ring, and a large metal bead. In the same region he also found fourteen stelae with Arabic inscriptions, some in Kufic script and others in the ordinary script.

"In a second expedition in 1924 Father Azais visited the province of Soddo, southwest of Addis Ababa and northwest of Lake Zouai, and discovered some thirty large funerary slabs as much as three meters high, without inscriptions, but ornamented with various sculptured designs. Early in 1925, Father Azais undertook his third trip of exploration. This time he traveled through the Sidomo country as far as the sixth degree latitude north. On that trip at Wando, Abela, Alata, Aberra and Derasa, he came upon large phallic menhirs, generally of basalt or granite. These phalic stones do not resemble anything that we know even in India, but, strange to say, they find a parallel in the menhirs of the same type discovered in the forests of Yucatan, Mexico. Now Father Azais is on a fourth expedition. He intended to go farther south, perhaps to the region of the Great Lakes. His work so far is that of a pioneer: he is preparing the ways for further and more systematic excavations, at the same time he is endeavoring to crate an interest in this new field of research."

The total enrollments for all Catholic colleges and universities in the United States was 60,169 in 1924 and 48,888 in 1922.

While there are 17 men's colleges which have enrollments of 1,000 or more students, but one women's college has more than 1,000 students, and, on the whole, there is indicated a tendency toward the small student body plan of school. There are only 11 women's colleges with student bodies of 500 or more.

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College in Indiana has the largest student body of any Catholic college for women, with 1,043 enrolled.

By a remarkable coincidence the schools with the second and third largest student bodies are both in the city of San Antonio, Texas. Our Lady of the Lake College, with 935 students, is the second largest, while Incarnate Word College, which 800 women attend, is the third largest.

James Ford Rhodes, one of the leading historians in the United States, died at Brookline, Mass., on January 22.

Mr. Rhodes had long been considered one of the highest authorities on American history. He was born in Cleveland in 1849. He attended New York University and the University of Chicago, but did not graduate at either institution. This lack of a bachelor's degree in arts was made up for by his receiving in later years the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Harvard, Yale, Wisconsin, Princeton, California, Western Reserve and New York University and that of Doctor of Literature from Oxford, Kenyon and Brown.

The Berlin Academy of Sciences awarded Mr. Rhodes the Loubat prize in 1901. The National Institute of Arts and Letters gave him its gold medal in 1910, and he won the Pulitzer prize for history in 1918. His great work was a history of the United States, which appeared at intervals between 1893 and 1920, and to which he had devoted the best part of forty years' labor. The first instalment, entitled *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, carried the narrative down to 1877, the first of the seven volumes appearing in 1893 and the

last in 1906. Then came the *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley*, issued in 1919. A revised edition of the whole work was published in 1920 in eight volumes. Two years later came *The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations.*

Other works by Mr. Rhodes were his *History of the Civil War*, in one volume, his *Historical Essays*, and a volume containing his lectures on the American Civil War delivered at Oxford.

A London correspondent of the Washington *Star* states that archaeologists are greatly excited over the news from Copenhagen that Dr. Noerlund, leader of the Danish archaeological and geological expedition to South Greenland, has reported the discovery of the foundations of a large cathedral at Ivigo in the district where the Norsemen lived under Eric the Red about the year 1000 A. D.

The Norse colony in Greenland and its virtual disappearance into thin air has long been the subject of discussion and speculation among archaeologists, historians and clerics, for in the Middle Ages a large and prosperous colony simply ceased to exist and no reliable traces of the community have ever been found.

Some 900 years ago, Eric the Red, a Viking ruler, and his son, Lief Erickson, planted colonies of Norsemen in Greenland and introduced Christianity. By the beginning of the twelfth century Greenland had a bishop, and there were at least 12 Norse churches in the Middle Ages.

From 1247 to 1261 Greenland was a republic, but later the colonies gave allegiance to the Kings of Norway. There were some 10,000 inhabitants of Viking breed in the Arctic Circle when the last reliable statistics were compiled, and the complete disappearance of the "Lost Colonies" is more of a historical tragedy than the story of the "Lost Continent" of Atlantis.

The colonists had to rely mainly for supplies on regular Scandinavian expeditions which sailed every summer from Norse ports. In the fourteenth century Europe was ravaged by "The Black Death" plague and the dispatch of relief expeditions to Greenland was discontinued. Scandinavia had enough to do to succor and feed its own resident population, and the Greenland colonists were overlooked for some years.

When after a considerable interval relief vessels were again sent to Greenland, the sailors were unable to find the old harbor entrance at Ivigo—it had, evidently, been frozen up or blocked by glaciers. Further investigations revealed no trace of the 10,000 members of the colony, and it was clear that they must have died, migrated or dispersed in search of more hospitable regions.

Whether any of the colonists intermarried with the Eskimos and escaped southward has been a subject for controversy, and there were not wanting optimists during the past 200 years who imagined that the colony must have moved to other parts of the Arctic, and that their descendants could still be found living in inland valleys. No such traces were ever found, however, and it is traditionally understood that the last Norse Bishop of Greenland died around 1377.

Dr. Noerlund's expedition has located the ancient bishop's palace at Ivigo, and established that it covered some five and a half acres. It was built of red sandstone, probably in the twelfth century. The explorers have brought back the skeleton of a bishop—judged to be a bishop by the episcopal ring still on the finger of one hand. A bishop's crozier, made of walrus horn, is among the finds, and from historical records it is taken that the skeleton may have been that of Bishop Jon Sverresfestre, an adopted son of King Sverre of Norway.

There were several chapels and other buildings in the neighborhood of the palace and cathedral. In another place were found the remains of a church, presumed to have been built by the wife of Eric the Red; also a runic stone with a remarkable inscription, so far untranslated.

The Madrid correspondent of the N. C. W. C. *News Service* says:

The plenary council recently convened in Lisbon is not merely the confirmation of the religious resurrection of Portugal, it is at the same time a symbol and a promise of hope for the Catholics of all nations subjected to religious persecution. The religious renaissance in Portugal is nothing short of a miracle—in fact, it has been characterized as a "collective conversion."

In order to appreciate the true significance of the plenary council, it is necessary to recall that only 15 years ago Portugal was the scene of a political revolution which was immediately transformed into a religious persecution. Sacrilegious attacks on the Church began immediately after the assassination of King Carlos I and the crown prince, and continued with the accession of Don Manuel II who was soon forced to flee from the country. Convents were destroyed; religious were driven out; churches were burned; bishops were attacked; Catholic worship was persecuted and religious instruction prohibited; Church property was confiscated and the religious marriage ceremony declared null and void; atheism triumphed in the universities and demagogy triumphed in the streets. Portuguese Catholics lived through days more bitter even than the present period in Mexico.

The present national council is a sign of the tremendous change which has come about since then.

There is something deeply significant about this council, presided over by one of the foremost victims of the former persecutions, the venerable patriarch of Lisbon, Dr. Mendes y Belo, who is acting as papal legate, and who is surrounded by all the bishops of the nation, including those of the adjoining islands and those who have come from the Portuguese possessions beyond the seas. Many of these prelates bear on their bodies the permanent traces of the tortures and sufferings which they have endured for the faith. But the greatest miracle of all is, that in the tribune of honor, facing the bishops during the sessions, at which relations of the Church and state are discussed, are gathered the cabinet ministers of Portugal, the ministers of that republic which declared war

to the death against the Church, the representatives of those revolutionary groups which, in 1911, stoned the bishops, sacked the convents and persecuted the faithful.

One of the most attractive features of the Holy Year in Rome was undoubtedly the Vatican Missionary Exhibition, which was suggested and established by the Holy Father.

Missionaries from all parts of the globe sent exhibits and details of their apostolic work, and visitors to the Exhibition were enabled to get some idea of the gigantic struggle carried on with much success by the One True Church against the powers of darkness.

His Holiness in his addresses to pilgrims during the Holy Year was wont to compare the Missionary Exhibition to an open book, and such, indeed, it was—a book, too, which made a lasting impression on all who read it and made an eloquent appeal for the heroic missionary cause.

With the close of the Jubilee Year came, too, the close of the Vatican Exhibition, but the Holy Father promised that the magnificent collection would not be lost, and that a permanent place would be set aside where the precious objects could be viewed and the lesson they eloquently taught could still be learned.

This promise His Holiness fulfilled some time ago, when he issued a "Motu Proprio" constituting a Missionary Museum in a wing in the Lateran Palace adjoining the Christian and Pagan Museum already established there. The "Motu Proprio" says:

> Because so many and such noble documents of faith and of the apostolate, gathered together in the Vatican Missionary Exposition, not only aroused the interest and admiration of a great throng of visitors, but have, moreover, offered to future missionaries an abundant and precious fund of material for instruction and preparation, it has not seemed fitting to Us that they should be dispersed upon the closing of the same Exposition.
>
> With mature deliberation We have devised the means of conserving the greatest part, by constituting in Our Lateran Palace, with the Profane and Christian Museum, an Ethnological Missionary Museum, in which not only the articles of greatest importance and attractiveness in the exposition may be arranged and disposed but also that other articles may be collected similar to them and—as We desire most ardently—may enrich it still further.
>
> To the end of preparing in the above mentioned Palace a worthy seat for the new Museum, We have established that the parochial archives collected there may be transferred to the Braccio di Carlo Magno, and arranged in manner which shall offer conditions of full security, and such as shall correspond to the most modern evigencies of such Archives. And having made the necessary restorations and embellished the place of the Archives in the Lateran Palace for the great advantage of all, We have established that this place be assigned to the Ethnological Missionary Museum and become their seat.

Finally, in regard to the order and conservation of the three Museums, viewing the distances of places and the particular exigencies derived from these conditions, it has seemed opportune to Us for the hierarchical unity and administration of the Pontifical Museums, to entrust them to a Commission which will be composed as follows:

1—A Secretary pro tempore of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, in quality of President;

2—A Director General, pro tempore, of Pontifical Museums and Galleries;

3—a Scientific Director of the Ethnological Missionary Museum.

4—the Administrative Director of the Museums of the Lateran Palace who will act as secretary and will be charged with the carrying out of the deliberations of the Commission after the President shall have referred them to the Holy Father, and shall have reported his approval.

In the matter of voting, in case of an equal ballot, that side shall prevail which has the vote of the President.

And now, from the depths of Our heart, We form the wish that, as during the Jubilee Year, the Vatican Missionary Exposition has aroused the unanimous admiration of visitors for the great works of the apostolate and the task fulfilled by the missionaries, so the Ethnological Missionary Museum, following and always better attaining to this noble end, will serve to diffuse the knowledge and imitation of those generous souls who have consecrated to the Missions their work and their lives, and will co-operate in such manner for the supreme end of those Missions, that is, to the glory of God and the extension of His Kingdom on earth.

"Given at Rome, from Our Vatican Palace, on November 12, 1926, in the fifth year of Our pontificate. POPE PIUS XI."

Representatives of twenty nations celebrated recently in Paris the centenary of Laënnec, the greatest doctor since Hippocrates.

M. Doumergue, together with the Papal Nuncio, presided at the Sorbonne at an essembly of the learned societies. The memory of Laënnec was praised by the Rector of the University of Paris, the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, and by M. Painlevé, War Minister, in the name of the Government. There was another big meeting at the Academy of Medicine, and a reception at the Town Hall of Paris.

The nave of the Cathedral of Notre Dame was filled with French and foreign doctors for a Requiem Mass, in memory of the great doctor. They had been invited by the society of St. Luke, a society for French doctors, which has 2,000 members.

Cardinal Dubois presided, and the President of the Republic was represented by General Gouraud, Military Governor of Paris. The Mass was celebrated by a priest, who is also a doctor.

René-Theophile-Hyacinthe Laënnec, discovered of auscultation and father of modern knowledge of pulmonary diseases, was born in 1781, and died at the early age of 45.

A significant ceremony took place in Rome Sunday morning, December 5, with the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Cyril Kurteff as Titular Bishop of Briula and Apostolic Administrator of the Bulgarian Catholics of the Slavic Rite. Monsignor Kurteff is the first Bulgarian bishop ever consecrated in Rome.

The highest meaning is attached to the selection of the Basilica of St. Clemente for the ceremony. In this basilica, which is the titular church of Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, rest the bones of St. Ignatius of Antioch and of St. Clemente, third successor of St. Peter in the Papal chair. In addition, here is buried the body of St. Cyril, the great apostle to the Slavic races, who died in Rome in 868, where he had come to obtain from Pope Adrian the second approbation of the Slavic liturgy.

Here, then, was sanctum of the heroism of the Slavic Catholics and of their great patrons in which to commission a new leader of the Faith among them.

Rev. Fr. John G. Hagen, S. J., who for more than fifteen years was Director of the Astronomical Observatory at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., was one of four men to receive high honors on the occasion of the inauguration by Pope Pius XI of the academic year of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences in December.

Father Hagen, who now is Director of the Vatican Observatory and who is a distinguished scientist, was awarded a gold medal as one of the four most meritorious members of the Academy.

Four members of the Sacred College, Their Eminences, Cardinals Vannutelli, Merry del Val, Maffi and Ehrle, were present at the ceremony, which was held in the Casino Pius IV in the Vatican Gardens. The president of the Academy, the Very Rev. Joseph Giafranceschi, S. J., in his inaugural discourse spoke of the contributions of the Catholic Church to science. These have been confirmed of late, he said, by the scientific institutions of Pope Pius XI, such as the Catholic University of Milan, the new Georgetown University at Rome, the Oriental Institute, the Archaeological Institute; and the Ethnological Missionary Museum. In addition, the President thanked the Holy Father for his moral and material patronage of the Academy.

After various members of the Academy had presented papers of high scientific interest, Pope Pius spoke, declaring that no institution ever had made such contributions toward science and art as had the Catholic Church.

The inaugural ceremony, His Holiness continued, was particularly pleasing to him as a most desirable Christmas gift. Recalling that medals are often bestowed for military merit, he described the awards just made to the four academicians as "our pacific gold medals." He concluded by bestowing the Apostolic Blessing.

Father John G. Hagen labored in the United States for many years. It was in this country that he made the scientific studies and published the learned works which stamped him as an eminent scientist and eventually attracted the attention of the Vatican.

For some years after coming to this country he taught chemistry at Prairie du Chien. He then went to Georgetown University at Washington, where he was stationed until 1907. It was while there that he published his "Synopsis of Higher Mathematics," and his memorable work "The Variable Stars." While in this country he also made preliminary publications on the works of Euler, the famous mathematician.

A new Church, dedicated to Our Lady, with an altar made of stones taken from the famous Abbey, was opened recently at Glastonbury. Thus what was once the source and fountain head of Christianity in Britain and North-West Europe, claiming an unbroken continuity with apostolic times, has again, after four centuries, become the center of Catholic activity.

The event is one of no small interest in view of the history of the place. It is said that in obedience to a vision Joseph of Arimathea there built an oratory of wattles, which was dedicated to Our Blessed Lady by her Divine Son Himself, and history tells us that a great Benedictine Abbey grew up around it, whose fame was world-wide.

And not only was the faith first preached at Avalon, the ancient name for Glastonbury, but it was also preserved there without any return to paganism.

Though now thirteen miles from the Bristol Channel, Glastonbury was originally an island, encircled by broad fens, the steep conical hill called Glastonbury Tor rising therefrom to a height of about four hundred feet. It was a refuge for those driven westward by invading bands, and most of the tribes which found a sanctuary there (in particular the Teutons) had already received the Faith before they reached Avalon.

Nowhere else can an unbroken continuity with apostolic times be found. And it is almost certain that St. Augustine found the Faith being taught and the Sacraments being administered at Glastonbury when he landed in England. That state of things lasted until the Reformation, when the last Abbot was martyred on the Tor, close by the Abbey.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph Rainer, rector emeritus of St. Francis seminary, St. Francis, Wis., and Prothonotary Apostolic, died at the seminary Jan. 19.

Msgr. Rainer was born Feb. 10, 1845. He was educated at the Gymnasium of Bozon, Tyrol, and at the University of Innsbruck, Tyrol, Austria. For nearly sixty years he was connected with St. Francis seminary. He became a professor there following his ordination to the priesthood in 1867, and in 1887, became rector holding that position for 35 years when he became rector emeritus. He was also vicar general emeritus et honoris causa of the Milwaukee Archdiocese, and beside the dignity of Monsignor, held the rank of prothonotary apostolic, honors

bestowed upon him by His Holiness Pope Pius X, in recognition of his long service in the training of young men for the priesthood.

Msgr. Rainer was the author of *Life of Dr. Joseph Salmann* (in German); *Conferences on the Office of the Immaculate, A Greek-English Exercise Book,* and *Jubilee Poems on Leo XIII.*

Mr. Charles J. Jaegle, a Knight of St. Gregory, who, in 1916, received a Certificate of Affiliation to the Capuchin Order from the late Minister General, Father Bernard von Andermath, O. S. F. C., died at Pittsburgh in November. Mr. Jaegle was the founder of the *Pittsburgh Catholic Observer,* one of the best known Catholic journals in the country.

Born in Freiburg, Germany, in 1853, Mr. Jaegle came to America and settled in Pittsburgh in 1868. In 1880 he was appointed manager of the new *Pittsburgh Beobachter,* a German Catholic newspaper. In 1898 he launched the *Observer,* which he continued to publish until ten years ago, when the business was acquired by his son, and he retired from active business. He was created a knight of St. Gregory by the Pope, Benedict XV., in 1916.

Mr. Jaegle was a charter member and one of the organizers of the Catholic Press Association of the United States and Canada, and served as treasurer of the organization until the time of his retirement from active publication work. The honor conferred on him by the Capuchin Order was a special distinction, rarely granted to laymen.

The death of the Rev. Dr. Aurelio Palmieri on October 18 was a distinct loss to the Catholic press in Europe, notably that section which is interested in Oriental studies.

La Europa Orientale, with which he was closely identified, says of him and his work:

Ne diamo l'ennunzio con grade tristezza. Il suo nome e legato ai primi sforzi da noi tentati per aprire agli italiani una diretta visione dell'Oriente europeo. Venne a noi qualche anno dopo la foundazione dell'Istituto e fu un collaboratore dotto, assiduo, tenace. Aveva viaggiato gran parte dei Paesi da noi studiati, ne possedeva le principali lingue, ne conosceva la letteratura la storia la cultura. Gli affidammo la direzione della sezione slava, ma egli si occupava con grande amore degli studi bizantini e neoellenici, come attestano i suoi numerosi scritti in proposito, il primo volume degli studi bizantini da lui curato ed il secondo volume di tali studi, a cui egli attendeva da qualche anno, e che uscirà tra breve.

Se sono abbondanti i suoi studi bizantini e neoellenici, non sono pochi i suoi studi slavi, come può verdersi dalla bibliografia che ha curato Ettore lo Gatto, suo collaboratore affettuoso da più anni. Nè son pochi i suoi lavori politici, letterari e sopratutto di storia delle chiese orientali e le traduzioni, di cui converrebbe anche pubblicare una bibliografia, poichè sono dispersi in riviste o raccolte di molti paesi e in varie lingue.

La sua attività era veramenhte instancabile. Talora la febbre di scrivere nuoceva persino alla perfezione dei lavori, ma essi riuscivano nondimeno sempre interessanti, per la larghezza di informazioni, la copiosa dottrina, la larga possibilità che egli aveva di attingere direttamente a fonti inesplorabili per chi non possiede le lingue dell'Oriente europeo.

On December 28 and 29, Notre Dame University was host to the American Catholic Philosophical Association for its second annual meeting. Representatives of forty of the leading Catholic colleges, seminaries, and universities were present, headed by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Pace, Vice-Rector of the Catholic University of America, whose presidential address was the outstanding feature of the distinguished gathering. Dr. Pace is justly regarded as the leading exponent of Catholic philosophy in the country. A pioneer in the field of scholastic philosophy, he has for long years upheld the prestige of Thomistic teaching. His address, was a model of clarity and precision. Contemporary philosophy [he said] has been a series of substitutions: man for God; brain for soul; event for substance; intuition for reason; the beautiful for the good; evolution for creation; mechanism for purpose. "If truth itself is continually in motion, as some have asserted, it evolves it and not merely our attainment of it; then plainly we need not to be much concerned and substitutions and transfers of meaning, however inconsistent they may appear at a given moment." Interpreting the function of scholasticism, he stated this to be a method "to put people on their guard against substitutes, which in learned phrase only befog thinking, and warn them of interpretations which take out of life its essential meaning."

The papers read at the meeting were "Psycho-Physical Parallelism," by Rev. John F. McCormick, S.J. (Marquette University, Milwaukee); "The New Realism," by Sister Mary Verda, Ph. D. (St. Mary's College, Notre Dame); "Contemporary Conceptions of Religion," by Dr. Fulton J. Sheen (Catholic University of America); "The Theory of Values," by Dr. John A. Ryan (Catholic University of America). Discussion of the papers followed in which Rev. Pierre H. Bouscarren, S.J. (St. Louis University), Dr. Charles C. Miltner, C. S. C. (Notre Dame University), Rev. Bernard Voght, O. F. M. (St. Anthony's Monastery, Butler, N. J.), and Dr. Gerald B. Phelan, St. Michael's College, Toronto, Canada), participated.

Since its inauguration just a year ago the American Catholic Philosophical Association has made great progress, and its success augers well for the development of the Neo-scholastic movement in the United States. Recently Cardinal Bisleti, Perfect of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, addressed a letter of congratulation to the President of the Association; and expressions of good will and promises of co-operation have come from France, Belgium, England, Germany, and Italy.

The Association now has an official organ—*New Scholasticism*, of which the first number has already appeared. It contains articles by such eminent Cath-

olic scholars as Professors DeWulf, Gilson, Schwitalla, and Haldi. It is an attractive publication whose purpose is to carry the message of the philosophy of Saint Thomas to English-speaking peoples.

The Catholic Relief Bill which was passed by the English Parliament on December 3 met much opposition from the fast-diminishing contingent of the enemies of toleration within the British realm. During the debate on the bill, a heated debate occurred; but when the call came for a "division" in the House of Commons, the opponents of the measure failed to register their opposition and it passed its third reading after five hours of furious debate. The Bill passed its three readings in the House of Lords successfully, and later received the King's signature. The Bill completes the work of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 and removes the statutory disabilities of the Reformation against clergy and laity, ranging from exile, death by torture, and forfeiture of lands to petty persecution and anti-Catholic riots, including the disruption of religious processions. This Bill marks a record of a great event in English history and a golden milestone in the long progress of the Catholic Church toward freedom and justice.

The *American Historical Review* (January issue) announces that the subcommittee of the International Committee of Historical Sciences on an *International Yearbook of Historical Bibliography* which met in Paris, in October of last year had recommended to the International Committee that the *Bibliography* should not include books and articles devoted to international history, which are left to be dealt with in the numerous national biographies. The following scheme of sections or sections was provisionally adopted: (1) auxiliary sciences; (2) general works; (3) pre-history; (4) the ancient empires; (5) Greek history; (6) Roman history; (7) Byzantine history; (8) the history of the Middle Ages; (9) religious and ecclesiastical history; (10) the history of civilization—letters, sciences, arts; (11) the history of ideas; (12) economic and social history; (13) the history of institutions; (14) the history of relations between peoples—migrations, colonization, diplomatic history, questions of the Orient, the Baltic, the Pacific, etc.; (15) comparative political history; (16) the history of Asia; (17) the history of Africa. The Yearbook will be edited under the direction of a permanent international committee, to be appointed, the secretary of which will probably serve as the general editor. In each country a group of correspondents or a committee will be asked to provide on uniform cards the titles and bibliographical information respecting the works produced in that country which are to be included in the Yearbook. The first Yearbook will probably contain the writings of 1926. To co-operate with the International Committee on this subject the American Historical Association has appointed a special committee for the United States consisting of Professors Michael Rostovtzeff, Francis A. Christie, and Lynn Thorndike.

It is also announced that the Sixth International Congress of Historical Sciences will be held in Oslo on August 13-18, 1928. Inquiries from scholars in

the United States respecting the Congress, especially as to participation in the programme, should be addressed to the secretary of the American Historical Association, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, who served as chairman of the National Committee of the United States for the restoration of the University of Louvain, announced recently that invitations had been received for the formal ceremonies of the celebration of the Five Hundredth Anniversary of the founding of the University of Louvain, on June 28 and 29.

The committee for the restoration of Louvain raised the $500,000 originally asked for the purpose and co-operated with Secretary Hoover and others in completing the final fund of a million dollars.

A number of representative American institutions of learning and academies have been invited to send delegations to this function.

President Butler also announced that he has just received word from Louvain that the work of the construction of the library is going forward splendidly and that there is every expectation of it being completed before the end of 1927. Owing to the fall in Belgian exchange and to the fact that the building as finally planned is to cost more than twice the amount of the original estimate, the work of construction was temporarily suspended in August, 1925, through lack of available funds. Work was resumed, however, in June, 1926, and the main building and the middle wing are now quite complete. A very large number of books have been assembled for the new library, partly from German sources in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, but also largely under the leadership of the British committee appointed to deal with this aspect of the work, the head of which was Dr. Henry Guppy, librarian of the John Rylands Library of Manchester.

Alma Mater, the official organ of the College of the Propaganda (Urban College of the Propagation of the Faith), one of the greatest Theological institutions in the world, announces officially that during the year will be celebrated the third centennary of its foundation by Pope Urban VIII. The number containing the announcement, lists among its alumni the names of His Eminence, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston; His Eminence, Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Cardinal Bonzano, Cardinal Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago, and many eminent ecclesiastics, among whom are noted three Patriarchs, (a Syrian, a Maronite and a Armenian), five Superiors General of Religious Orders, 60 Archbishops and Bishops of the Latin Rite and 25 of the Oriental Rite.

The *Alma Mater* calls on all her sons to help her in the forthcoming celebration so that it may go down in the history of the Church as one of the most glorious events that has ever transpired. The programme will include an invitation to visit the College, to renew visits to the Basilicas and the other great religious

monuments of Rome, and finally to kneel at the feet of the Father of Christendom, Pope Pius XI, and receive his blessing.

This great celebration has been arranged to take place near the end of May, 1927. It will, in an imposing way, revive the grand and glorious story of the past of this great College and will bring the ideal and the needs of the missions before the minds of Catholics all over the world in a very special manner.

Several valuable books have recently been presented to the library of the Catholic University of America, by His Eminence Cardinal Gasparri, Papal Secretary of State. Among them are the twelfth and latest volume of the complete records of the Council of Trent (1563), the two folios of Father Beda Kleinschmidt on the great frescoes of the Basilica of St. Francis at Assisi, and the first volume (Genesis) of the new Vatican Edition of the Vulgate, or Latin version of the Bible, as it left the hands of St. Jerome.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mother Philippine Duchesne. By Marjory Erskine. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926. Pp. xi + 400.

Every student of Church History will read with interest this new life of Venerable Mother Philippine Duchesne. In a pleasing, modern style, the author tells her story with historic accuracy. She has encrusted within her pages brilliant names among the ecclesiastics of the last century. But she has done more. She has given us the history of a soul. Deftly does she reveal hopes deferred, longings attained, aspirations realized, ambitions achieved, of one whose absorbing passion was zeal for souls. The fire of an apostle burned in the breast of Philippine Duchesne, a fire which the fury of the French Revolution served only to inflame.

In Grenoble of historic Dauphiny Rose Philippine Duchesne was born on August 20, 1769. A Visitation convent was there, perched on the heights like an eyrie for souls winging their way heavenward. Within its sacred walls she made her first communion and received that solid education which stood her in such good stead in after year. Here too, in spite of family opposition, in spite of missionary longings, she entered as a fervent postulant, thinking that like another Teresa of Avila, she could work, suffer, and pray for the savages whom she already loved so well. Who will deny that the trying years she passed as a Visitandine were part of God's plans in the fashioning of her whom He destined later to lead the van guard of religious missionary women in the vast tracts of our Middle West?

The French Revolution caused the suppression of the Visitation at Grenoble, and Philippine Duchesne found herself once more in her father's house, once more in the world, but less than ever of it. When anti-religious feeling had moderated, she tried in vain to reorganize the religious community of which she had been a member. Then it was that through the influence of the Fathers of the Faith, she succeeded in having the tiny religious family who looked to her for inspiration, amalgamated with the nascent Congregation of the Sacred Heart. In 1804 under the youthful foundress, St. Madeleine Sophie Barat, she

and her few faithful followers began their novitiate. The leader was now a subject once more. But with her entrance among the Religious of the Sacred Heart a whole new horizon opened up before her. Missionary longings again asserted themselves, this time to be satisfied, though only after a trial of fourteen years.

It was not until 1818, at the suggestion of Bishop Du Bourg, that she and four companions sailed for America. When they landed in New Orleans, they were hospitably received by the Ursulines. Did these daughters of St. Angela see in Philippine Duchesne another Mary of the Incarnation? A like spirit of prayer and zeal animated both. Mother Duchesne did in the nineteenth century on the banks of the Mississippi what Mary of the Incarnation, the Teresa of the New World, according to Bossuet, accomplished in the seventeenth, along the St. Lawrence. These five privileged religious began their first labors on American soil at St. Charles, Mo. Our country was just recovering from the throes of its second war with Great Britain. The recent Louisiana Purchase had added vast tracts of land to our territory, and the young Republic was now ready to open up the Mississippi valley to new settlers. In this region Lady Poverty was poor enough to satisfy even her most ardent lover. Trials enough were there to satiate even the liveliest thirst for austerities.

Amid these rude beginnings was built up that net work of religious education for poor and rich alike which is now conducted under the auspices of the Church throughout the length and breadth of the Mississippi Valley. Not only among the Indians and the young daughters of the settlers did Mother Duchesne labor. She wielded a powerful influence among the ecclesiastics of her day. To her many of them looked for inspiration in their arduous labors. On her they all gazed in admiration. Among the religious of her own Society she was ever held in lofty veneration. Whether as intrepid superior among her loved Indians, or loyal subject in the lowly duties of the classroom, virtue shone in all her ways. One can not regret the treatment of a harsh Mother Galitzin, when one remembers that in Mother Duchesne's case, Mary dominated Martha.

As we turn page after page of this interesting biography, names sacred in the annals of the Church in America loom up. Struggles, difficulties, disappointments, trials abound. Privations superabound. It is a thrilling story. But in the midst of it all, Philippine Duchesne went on quietly and prayerfully with her work for the Indians, until in a tiny room of what would now be looked upon as a hovel, after thirty-four years of missionary labor, she yielded up her soul to God on November 18, 1852. Eighty-three years of life had been given to her. Into those years she had crowded all that was noblest and best in human endeavor. She was privileged to make the great sacrifice with such dispositions as lead us to hope that one day the Church will place on her altars this intrepid apostle.

The volume before us in well illustrated. The print and binding are what we should expect from the publishers. The author's sympathetic handling of her subject lends interest to her charming style. She has placed us in her debt by this contribution to the history of Catholic education. She has added another volume of absorbing interest to that already large number of biographies of heroic women who rank among the standard bearers of the Faith in the nineteenth century.

J. F. L.

In the Name of Liberty, Selected Addresses. By William Bourke Cochran. New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1925. Pp. + 409.

Bourke Cochran was born in County Sligo, Ireland, in 1854. Educated in Ireland and France, he came to America in 1871. Passing the bar after five years of hard study and laborious work for a livelihood, he became a leader in New York democracy. His fame for eloquence, matchless voice, and refined diction won recognition in Democratic national conventions and in Congress where he served seven terms. A picturesque figure in American political life, he was not a mere politician. He did not trim, and hence at times, as in 1896, found himself outside his party. He held to his principles and kept the faith as he saw it. Cochran was a patriotic lover of America as a land of liberty and opportunity and almost worshipful of its constitution and

institutions. He was a good Irishman. He understood Ireland's economic, political, and religious problems; and in America, the old land had no more convincing spokesman. The editor observes that: "His love of Ireland, as he often said, grew ever deeper as the years went by, and he counted confidently upon the presence of that same affection in every Irishman, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, whether high in power and social station, or one of the world's humble toilers. To him, always, an Irishman was a blood brother, and Irish freedom the clarion call that never failed to stir." He was a firm Catholic, in later years being a daily communicant. And that sums up Bourke Cochran: a Democrat, an Irishman, a Catholic, and a true American.

Mr. Robert McElroy has done well in editing the selected addresses of Cochran, for they deserve perpetuation. There is far too little in the way of biographies, letters, and speeches of Catholic leaders in American life. There has been great neglect. The student of American history and government might well read: his tribute to Abraham Lincoln; his speech in Madison Square Garden on "Sound Money" in which he warned against changing the republic of Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson to one of Altgeld, Tillman, and Bryan: the address "In the Name of Liberty" at Faneuil Hall before the New England Anti-imperialistic League in opposition to expansion in the Far East; "The Race Problem and the South" delivered in Montgomery, Alabama; his address before the Ohio Bar Association (1908) on the "Laws' Delays"; and his "John Marshall, Tribute of a Century." A conservative and no demagogue, Cochran took a sound, if somewhat eastern view, on economic problems as is evidenced by his speeches on "Expansion and Wages" at the University of Michigan, "America's Trust Problem" in joint debate with Bryan in Chicago, 1899, "Essential Conditions of National Prosperity" (1903), "The Problem of the Immigrant" in Congress, 1906, and "Farm Credits" delivered in Congress (1923), twelve hours before his death. A follower of Wilson, he spoke eloquently during the war: "The Cost of War" (1914), before the Knights of Columbus of New York, "Plea for Peace" (1915), in the Chicago Coliseum in support of the Pope's appeal, and the "World War—the Greatest of Crusades" (1917), as a welcome in Boston to the Belgian delegation. The cause

of Ireland he passionately plead in fervent speeches (1919) before the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees. "Why I am a Catholic," delivered in 1916 before a parliament of religious held in Flushing, Long Island, has sound apologetic value. He was both willing and competent to explain the position of the church and expound her doctrines.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

Histoire de l'Eglise (Collection belge de Manuels d'Histoire), Tournai, 1925. Pp. viii + 374.

Under the direction of an editorial board composed of seven professors of history and of Church history in Belgium, the series of volumes, of which this is the first, has for its purpose the restating of the historical past in terms of the latest source-material. Father Edouard De Moreau, S.J., the editor of this Manual of Church history, has presented within the compass of three hundred odd pages a closely knit outline of the past of Catholicism in the world. A special chapter dealing with the history of the Church in Belgium closes the volume.

The method of composition presents several changes from the typical manual. First of all, facts of political and social history are mentioned wherever they are needed to fill out the picture, but are kept, as they should be, subordinate to the religious factors in man's progress. Then, there is a more significant change:—namely, the internal history of the Church, always less known and less easily mastered by the student, is here given predominance over the external growth of Catholicism. The development of our knowledge of the faith, the history of ecclesiastical sciences, of heresy, ecclesiastical institutions, worship, the sacraments, devotions, ascetical life, religious orders, of Christian art and archeology, of charitable institutions, and of sanctity—these are the main topics dealt with in this excellent Manual. Under the triple division of the power conferred by Christ on the Church—government, teaching, and sanctification, Father Moreau has grouped the principal facts in each period and in each country, and while not neglecting the external history of the Church, places the proper emphasis upon this

inner growth of the Spouse of Christ and the Kingdom of God on earth.

As each new Manual of Church History appears, regardless of the country from which it comes, teachers in the United States peruse it carefully to see if it solves the many difficulties of their science. The factitious divisions which mean less in ecclesiastical history than in political or social history, the evaluation of long dead and forgotten heresies in terms of their modern counterparts, the proper balance between the inner life of the Church and its external development, the problem of a narrative which will have a judicious appeal to those old world aspects that concern the American Catholic in general and the theological student in particular—these are but a few of the questions still unsolved in the scientific presentation of ecclesiastical history. Father Moreau has all these in mind in his Manual and has, we believe, reached a better approach than many similar volumes in recent years.

P. G.

The Ars Minor of Donatus. By Wayland Johnson Chase. University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History. Number 11. Madison, 1926. Pp. 55.

This pamphlet consists of the Latin text and, according to the author, the first English translation of the Ars Minor, together with a sketch, by way of introduction, of the influence of this famous grammar in the course of the ages. The Latin text here used is taken from the *Grammatici Latini ex recensione Henrici Keilii*, IV (Leipsic, 1864), 355-66. Professor Chase's English translation, which accompanies the Latin text, is accurate and smooth. The introductory sketch of twenty-six pages presents data in support of the contention that no other grammar in the Middle Ages exerted an equal influence upon (1) the learning of Latin, (2) the form that Latin grammars have taken in the modern age, and (3), the terminology of the grammars of various vernaculars of Western Europe, especially English.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

A Bibliography of Early English Law Books. By Joseph Henry Beale, Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. viii + 304. (Issued under the auspices of the Ames Foundation).

Professor Beale has made some valuable contributions to legal literature, but his present volume, as well from the standpoint of its value as from that of the scholarly research and labor which its compilation entailed, transcends his previous efforts and places his name among those of the foremost benefactors of student and writer. The author disclaims ability as a bibliographer, yet his work carries conviction to the contrary. The task was undertaken by him, he says, because no one else had done it or seemed likely to do it. Whatever his motive, the result of his work is a distinct and inestimable service to those who labor in the broad field of law, whether as teacher or student, writer or practitioner. Anything like successful legal research has been rendered difficult, if not virtually impossible by the deplorable lack of complete bibliographies of the old English law books. Professor Beale's work does not, nor does it represent itself to, entirely supply this deficiency. It does, however, go very far toward meeting ordinary needs in this respect and its appearance cannot but lend zest to the newly-awakened interest in legal history, for it will afford students a means of approach to sources that have been hitherto difficult of access. This volume has more than a mere literary value. It will be found to have a practical usefulness whose extent is measurable by the degree to which the fabric of our present-day law owes its inception and development to the decisions of the English courts since the days of the Conqueror.

The author has divided his work into four chapters. The first consists of a collection of statutes from 1225 to 1597, abridgements and session laws; the second, contains a list of decisions to be found in the Year Books, abridgements and reports; the third chapter is devoted to treatises, and the fourth contains a list of printers and their law books. Here the author has supplied the dates for most of the books but he assures his readers that the dating is of the most tentative sort.

The two appendices which make up a third of the contents of the volume are by no means its least important part. The first is a collection of fifty wood cuts used by the sixteenth century printers, and the second is a table which gives in condensed form most of the information contained in the four chapters and also indicates where the books listed may be found in the libraries in England and America accessible to the public.

R. T. J.

NEBHU'AH: De Prophetiae Charismate in Populo Israelitico Libri Quattuor. By Marcus Antonius Van den Oudenrijn, O. P. Rome: Typographia Befani, MDCCCCXXVI. Pp. xxiv + 410.

Should any student of Church History take up this volume with the hope of finding in it some treatment of the phenomenon of "prophecy" recorded in apostolic and sub-apostolic literature, he is doomed to disappointment: only scattered references or allusions are as it were parenthetically made by the writer to New Testament "prophecy." But then our Church historian would have only himself to blame for his disappointment; for the title of this exegetico-dogmatic treatise distinctly announces a study of the gift of Prophecy *in populo Israelitico;* and the author has remained scrupulously within the limitations of his program. Too scrupulously perhaps: for, after all, is there not quite a close analogy between the "prophets" mentioned by St. Paul, especially in I Cor. xiv, and those Old Testament worthies whom Father Van den Oudenrijn styles *prophets secundarios?* About the latter, and about the rôle and extent and mode of their prophetical inspiration, as he warns us, our information is extremely scanty; with St. Paul in hand, on the contrary, we may arrive at a fair comprehension of the working of the charism in the New Testament prophets; by which, without stretching the analogy, our knowledge of the Old Testament *prophetae secundarii* at least might perhaps profit.

Be this as it may, certain it is at any rate that Father Van den Oudenrijn's treatment of his chosen topic is at least in its main lines well marshalled. At the outset, from the great variety of

names whereby the prophets were designated among the Hebrews, an accurate idea of what they were is drawn. To regard them as the popular view holds, merely as announcers of future events, is too narrow a conception of their rôle: the prophet is a man commissioned by God to announce to his fellow-men God's message, which is made known to him through revelation and may deal with past and present as well as future events. In the second Book the author traces through the Old Testament literature the history of prophecy; though why he relegated to the close of this section what he has to say about the origin of this institution, does not appear clearly. Book III, which extends over no less than one hundred and thirty-three pages, is devoted to the investigation of the psychology of prophecy, under the secure guidance of St. Thomas. Here again exception might perhaps be taken to the order of certain subdivisions; but this being of relatively little interest to historians, we shall not have the bad grace to insist. Of greater interest to them is that part of the last Book, which is taken up by the study of the prophetical guilds, or schools, as they are too frequently misnamed. The smallest allusions made by Scripture to the rôle which these guilds of prophets played in the political and religious history of the Israelite monarchies, their principal centers, the mode of life of their members, their habit, even the peculiar mark which seems to have distinguished them, have been carefully collected and scrutinized, with the result that the author has been particularly happy in the treatment of this part of his subject. He closes it by flatly—and rightly—rejecting the opinion advocated by some recent writers linking the Essenes with the old prophetical guilds.

There were in Old Testament time prophets and prophets. There were true prophets and false prophets. There were true prophets who were prophets by divine vocation; and others who were so by profession. Among the former there were some who may be qualified *majores*, and others *secundarii*. And among all classes, yea even among the true prophets, there were good and bad prophets. Father Van den Oudenrijn has evidently long rubbed elbows with them all in order to examine them at close range, and he moves at ease through their circles; and from his long intercourse with them he has brought back the materials of

one of the most complete treatises issued from a Catholic pen on Old Testament prophecy. His every page, too, text and notes, bears witness to his acquaintance with practically everything that has been written on or around his subject; and he always scrupulously renders to Ceasar the things that are Ceasar's even warning the reader when he is obliged to quote at second hand; quite independent withal in his judgments and opinions, always giving good arguments when he departs from the opinions of others; and ever careful in the qualification of his own statements. These are excellent qualities, which cannot be extolled too high. Yet little that is really new will be found in the volume. Neither should this be much wondered at: for we are duly informed that the book represents the course of lectures given by the author at the *Angelico* in 1920-1921: the Seminar, rather than the class-room, is the place where original research may be carried out and new ideas propounded and tested. We think, however, that the psychological study of prophecy could have profited to some extent by the results of modern experimental and mystical psychology: we have reference particularly to the pages devoted to prophetical dreams and the prophet's ecstasies.

Outwardly the volume, even in its paper covers, has not an unpleasant appearance; it is furnished with most complete indexes, and, last not least, to the reader's delight, the author evinces rare proficiency in the art all but lost—or shall I say more bluntly: the lost art?—of writing Latin, not simply aligning Latin words.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

England and the World: Essays arranged and edited by F. S. Marvin. Unity Series, VII. London: Oxford University Press. (American Branch.) Pp. 268.

This, the seventh volume of the "Unity Series" of essays edited by Mr. Marvin, takes us from the England of the prehistoric Avebury period to the England of the League of Nations. Perry, of University College, London, would connect the prehistoric cultures of Britain more directly with Egypt and with Crete than with the Iberian peninsula. Collingwood, of Oxford,

well shows that "for the Roman Empire, the English Channel did not exist. A man going northwards from the western Mediterranean crosses one important boundary where southern Gaul ends and northern Gaul begins; the next important boundary is that which marks the end of civilized Britain and the beginning of the military frontier district" (p. 46). The English conquest of Roman Britain, Professor Collingwood, furthermore, thinks, was more peacefully effected than we have come to believe though not, of course, without "plenty of local friction." The evidence of archaeology and place-names gainsays the traditions of a systematic conquest. Some of these traditions, like the Arthurian legend, "arose in or were modified by the Viking Age, and tend to project the events of that period backwards into the narrative of the Anglo-Saxon settlements" (p. 62). Mr. Carlyle contributes a short, but thoughtful essay on the Middle Ages. Only in respect to political development was England in the mediæval period unlike the continent. Intellectually and artistically England as well as the continent benefitted by the Keltic missionaries. Religiously England felt the "profound and passionate spiritual force" of the Church as much as the Continent and was as "profoundly devoted to the Roman See." As for the divergence that appears in the political aspects of civilization, Mr. Carlyle urges us to remember that "what was really happening was that in England were being preserved those great principles and those great forms of political society which were appropriate to the Middle Ages, and that it was England which restored those principles to Continental Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" (p. 75). Mr. Grant sees the Unity in History, which his predecessors had illustrated, preserved in the sixteenth century, even though "forces of repulsion and discord" substituted themselves for the elements of unity. "Foremost among them was the Catholic Church. Its achievements are amazing both in extent and success. By the end of the Thirteenth century the Church had given to the Western European world a common faith, a common language, a common ethical standard, a common worship. From Poland to England, from Sweden to Spain, men could communicate with one another with fewer practical or emotional difficulties in the thirteenth century than in the twentieth. If the Church had realized the practical prob-

lem that waited for solution, it might have given to the world some much larger measure of unity even that it did" (pp. 76-77). In the sixteenth century, however, "the religious world was split in two from the moment when in 1517 Luther affixed his challenge to the cathedral door of Wittenberg. From that time forward more and more Europe was divided into two camps, which we may label the Catholic and Protestant camps. All effort at conciliation failed, a relation of permanent hostility was set up, and religion, which had in the Middle Ages been a force working, however inadequately, for peace, became now an additional incentive to war. And, further, it must be noted that, in those countries which adopted some form of Protestant faith and practice, the new faith had little effect in promoting either national unity or international friendship with other countries of a like religious character" (p. 77). Persecution increased. In the political life of Europe the idea of the balance of power, in reality neither a system nor a principle, arose largely because of the evolution of sovereign states, "recognizing no superior in religion or in government, referring their quarrels to no arbitrators or tribunal" (p. 79). Yet even in this century, "in which the unity of the human race and its common interests were hardly mentioned, or, if mentioned, found little attention" (p. 80). Mr. Grant succeeds in finding unity: in religion, the relations between the sweet, genial and pious martyr, More, and the scholar, Erasmus, and the *via media* policy of the English Church; in politics the enmity for Spain that begot the earliest cordial entente between England and France; in art and literature, the Renaissance. The political unity seems to us, however, somewhat imaginary. Equally interesting and thoughtful are the chapters that follow—on the seventeenth century by Mr. Gooch—and we regret that space forbids our noting how the thesis of the historical oneness of Europe is continued in them.

In the remaining five essays on England and the building of the New World by Miss Penson, on England in the East by Mr. Dodwell, on England and the League of Nations and on England and the Backward Race by the editor, and on the child's approach to Internationalism by Mr. Gould are discussed the practical problems which are the consequences of the development described in the earlier chapters. These essays maintain the

standard of those that precede them. Well may we say has Mr. Marvin succeeded in fulfilling the desire expressed at the International Moral Education Conference held at Geneva in 1922 that "the history taught to all the nations of the world should have international as well as a national bearing;" that "it should have regard to the position of each nation in the international order, what each people has gained from, and given to, the others in the course of its evolution" (Preface, p. 3).

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN.

Joseph Chamberlain and the English Social Politics. By Elsie E. Gulley, Ph. D. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Vol. CXXIII, No. 1, Columbia University Press. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926. Pp. 340.

Chamberlain, the imperialist, appears in this dissertation in what some may regard as a lesser role. Social reformers usually are not accorded the credit that is due the intrinsic value of their services. Diplomats and generals receive the applause of the multitude: their deeds are often more spectacular than essentially valuable. That Chamberlain was one of the early advocates of the use asphalt for street pavements, was the prime mover in securing for his city municipal gas and water, was active in many other social reform enterprises while Mayor and Councilman of Birmingham, should cause us to esteem him more truly. Dr. Gulley gives us still other reasons for regarding him more highly. She has chapters on his activities as a reformer of politics, as a promoter of popular education, as an advocate of establishment, as a champion of the rural as well as urban worker. He threw laissez-faire to the winds. English social welfare he promoted, too, by the furtherance of British imperial union and development. Though Miss Gulley seems to us at times somewhat too generous in her praises of Chamberlain, we are glad to have from her pen a study of this neglected phase of his life.

American Opinion of German Unification, 1848 - 1871. By John Gerow Gazley. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Vol. CXXI, No. 267, Columbia University Press. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926. Pp. 582.

The number of studies of public opinion in our country as manifested in the newspapers and magazines with respect to notable events in Europe is steadily increasing. The quality of these efforts has already been noted in past issues of the *Review*. Gaps are left to be filled, such as American opinion on Italian Unification, but when these are filled we may look for a substantial synthesis of that most subtle phase of history—the story of the evolution of American thought in a field that, with our more direct participation in the affairs of the world, is becoming daily of greater and greater importance. Dr. Gazley's dissertation will unquestionably be one of the most important bases of the synthesis for which we hope. He deals most systematically and very thoroughly with American opinion on events in the Germanies between 1848 and 1871. Over five hundred pages are devoted to this quarter's century in which the idea of German unification was reified. To attempt to trace even in outline the tendencies in American opinion and to analyse the causes of these tendencies would unduly lengthen our review. Two chapters especially commend to work to us—the first, a conclusion in which the reasons for American opinion in all its complexities and contradictions are reviewed, and the second, a critical discussion of the sources of the history of the American public opinion, the newspapers and journals, in the mid-nineteenth century.

The Preliminaries of the American Revolution as Seen in the English Press, 1763-1775. By Fred Junkin Hinkhouse. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* No. 276. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. Pp. 216.

Americans have come to regard the Revolution as a revolution rather than as a civil war. Such, however, it was not only

if considered territorially but also if considered intellectually. The colonies were part of the British Empire. Even in America a considerable number of good men and women was always loyal to the crown. Our loyalists thought as did the court party in England. The pariots in the colonies and in England had in common the Whig tradition. Though the former had under the influence of the frontier developed democratic ideas faster than the latter had in the homeland, both could and did refer to the revolution as a contest waged in a "common cause." "If once tyranny prevailed in America, it would be but a short step before its work would be accomplished in England. Then English liberties would be no more" (p. 200). The English newspapers printed communications favorable to the colonies before hostilities began and even while they were going on. Such conduct we all know would not nowadays be tolerated. That is was then possible is due to the fact that "impartiality was the ideal most in repute" with English journalists. "The great majority of papers strove for it, either in appearance or in fact" (p. 12).

Still Professor Hinkhouse does not attempt at any time to estimate the weight of public opinion. He ventures only his own opinions. The landed interests, probably the most influential group in England, were against the Americans. With them stood the Anglican churchmen. Opposed to the landed interests were the merchants and manufacturers, and opposed to the Anglicans were the non-conformists. The printers "by every canon of class interest were allied to the merchants, not to the landed aristocracy. Socially and economically they belonged to the rising middle class. When to this is added the fact that the press was very frequently persecuted by the members of the dominant group, the appearance of so much opinion in opposition to the government is more understandable" (p. 203). Professor Hinkhouse concludes his study—one of the best, we think, of the number of dissertations revealing public opinion as reflected by the press,—with the observation that "the friends of American England were not limited to a few advocates in Parliament but included a large and very vocal group outside, and that the war of the American Revolution was in a very real sense a civil war" (p. 205).

The Grain Supply of England During the Napoleonic Period, a Thesis. By W. Freeman Galpin. *University of Michigan Publications, History and Political Science,* VI. New York: The Macmillan Company, Pp. xii + 305.

The years in which Napoleon vexed Europe have proved as troublesome to the historical student to understand as they were hard for the Corsican's contemporaries to endure. The period seems to defy analysis. Decrees, orders-in-council, embargoes and non-intercourse acts distract the pages of our histories. Even this book is not easy to read. Still it removes many of our difficulties and makes possible a more attractive sythesis. Based four square on the sources, English and American, which require nineteen closely printed pages to list, it proceeds carefully to unravel the tangled threads of the English grain trade. Five chapters deal with this trade in general from 1799 to 1813, the year in which Napoleon's power was broken. In the remaining chapters it discusses important phases of the corn trade—licenses, American grain production, the continental blockade—and draws conclusions. Dr. Galpin finds that Napoleon could not have starved England into submission by means of the continental system. England was then in less danger than she was in the recent war. In the period, 1810-1814, furthermore the price of wheat was much lower than it was in 1800-1801, ranging from 100s 9d to 92s 7d in the former period and from 118s 7d to 156s 2d in the latter. The reasons for England's escape from starvation were that Napoleon had no means of interfering with England's coastwise or overseas supply of grain, that the England of the first decade of the nineteenth century was not so dependent on foreign states for her food as she was a hundred later that she was able by increased acreage and by careful policy of retrenchment and substitution to augment her home supplies so that she was practically self-sufficing.

NOTICES

(Selected volumes from this list will be reviewed in later issues.)

The Legacy of the Middle Ages, edited by C. G. Crump and E. F. Jacob (Oxford University Press, American Branch), is an invaluable compilation of essays dealing with various phases of mediaeval life, published together with forty-two plates admirably illustrating the text. The authors of the essays are the editors themselves, other distinguished English scholars, two French professors, one American, and two officials of the Louvre. The topics treated fall into three divisions. The first five chapters deal with the things of the mind and the spirit. In the three following treat of law, the most fundamental and characteristic of mediaeval bequests; the remainder are concerned with the fabric of society and government.

In a later issue this splendid work will be reviewed at some length.

Forgotten Shrines of Spain, by Mildred Stapley Byne (J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and London), is a timely contribution to literature by an authority on Spanish art and history. Mrs. Byne has the happy faculty of combining artistry with historic narrative and reveals charmingly the salient characteristics of a people whose dominating trait is pride in a historic past. To those who contemplate a visit to Spain the book will prove invaluable. Even for those who cannot enjoy the luxury of a visit to this land of beauty and romance will find compensation in the splendid illustrations, made from photographs by Arthur Byne. Whilst in no sense a guide book, the volume gives explicit directions as to how the shrines may be reached under existing conditions.

Students of mediaeval history owe a great debt to Professor Lynn Thorndyke, and his latest—may we venture to say?—most valuable work, *A Short History of Civilization*, has been greeted with great acclaim for all who have felt the need of such a volume for the class room. Professor Thorndyke tells us:

> I have written the book because I think it is needed. . . . So far there has been no adequate presentation of the main thread of the story of civilization between the covers of a single volume, or, for that matter, in any one work, at least in English.

The book is published by F. S. Crofts & Co., New York, and the typographical job is excellent. We hope to present an adequate review of this important volume shortly.

Opuscula et Textus—historiam ecclesiae ejusque vitam atque doctrinam illustrantia.

Series scholastica et mystica—edita curantibus M. Grabman et Fr. Pelster, S.J.

Fasc. I—St. Thomae Aquinatis, De Ente et Essentia opusculum edidit Ludovicus Baur. Monasterii 1926. Pp. 60.

Fasc. II—Guidonis Terreni Quaestio de magisterio infallibli Romani Pontifis, quam edidit P. Bartholomaeus M. Xiberta O. Carm. Monasterii 1926. Pp. 32.

Fasc. III.—St. Thomae de Aquino, Quaestiones de natura fidei, ex commentario in libri tertii sententiarum distinctiones 23 et 24 secundum fidem manuscriptorum denuo edidit Franciscus Pelster S.J. Monasterii 1926. Pp. 64.

The Editors announce that their purpose in issuing these brochures is to afford easy access to the writings of some of the great scholastics on literary and speculative questions of Scholastic and Mystical Theology and Philosophy. Choice of texts is made from authors of various schools so that an insight may be had into the different opinions held and methods employed.

Some of the texts are taken from works that have already appeared in print, others from manuscripts. No commentary or explanation of the doctrine is given—merely the text and a critical apparatus to assist in the better understanding of the same. The brochures are well-adapted to use in the class-room or to private reading. They are published by the Aschendorf Press, Münster in Westphalia. E. G. F.

Christian Denominations, by Rev. Vigilius H. Krull, C.PP.S. (John W. Winterick, Cleveland, Ohio) has gone into its thirteenth edition. This is not surprising, for Fr. Krull has produced a most useful hand-book to the different sects, telling us about their organization and their tenets, and giving in each case the short Catholic answer to their various errors.

Messrs. Burns Oates and Washbourne (London) have just begun the issue, under the name of "The Calvert Series," a set of volumes, under the general editorship of Mr. Hilaire Belloc, which will prove of great value and interest. The first to be published is *The Catholic Church and the Appeal to Reason*, by Mr. Leo Ward, the younger son of those two famous Catholic writers, Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Ward. Mr. Belloc himself contributes a volume on the Catholic Church and History. Other volumes are by Mr. Chesterton on Conversion, by Fr. McNaab on Philosophy, and Sir Bertram Windle on Science.

Through the courtesy of Mr. W. G. Leland we have received the first issue of the *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences* (Les Presses Universitaires de France, Paris). It contains much that interests students of history. It records the organization of historical workers in nine respective countries of those represented in the committee, the organization of historians in the United States being treated by Mr. Leland.

The *Bulletin* should meet with the cordial and generous support of students of history in this country. The subscription price is only $1 a volume (five numbers, with index). American subscriptions may be sent to the Yale University Press.

The Autobiography of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy. Translated by C. C. Swinton Bland (E. P. Dutton & Co., New York), is published as one of a series entitled "Broadway Translations." At the outset one is tempted to ask with Molière: *Que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère?* as some of the translations seem rather questionable company for the good monk.

As the singularly frank and outspoken autobiography of a devout Abbot in twelfth-century France this curious book has long been well known to medieval scholars. This English translation shows what a very readable and human document it is. Its value as a testimony to the state of religion in medieval France is to some extent lessened by the very strong prejudices and animosities of its author, though it is valuable because of the honest comment it supplies concerning the life and personages of the time during which Abbot Guibert served God—comment on monasteries and the fortunes of the Church, glimpses of Saint Anselm, Rufus the Red, and the fighting nobles of Laon, etchings of beliefs and traditions current among many.

The seventy years between 1053 and 1124 were, as Dr. Coulton, the editor, says, distinguished by a renaissance of thought and civilization in Europe which is almost comparable to the renaissance of two centuries and a half later. For all their confidence in what we generally incline to regard as superstitions, the early middle-ages, as Abbot Guibert describes them, were already in touch with Latinity and polite letters. He must have been exceptionally credulous, even in an age which had none of the modern aids to verification of rumors, true or false; and his book abounds in passages of invective against his enemies, or against the enemies of the Church, which reveal a lack of judgment in sifting evidence that would shock any modern sub-editor, to say nothing of judicial standards. But he was unquestionably a man of high integrity and of great religious zeal, and his memoirs give us many unforgettable glimpses of the surroundings in which he lived. As a piece of literature this autobiography must always rank high among the few early efforts at conscientious self-revelation; and he is just as candid in describing his own failures to achieve perfection in the monastic life as in denouncing the wickedness of princes whom he despised or neighbors who scandalized his ideals of straight dealing. It is curious to note his lamentation about the decadence of morals (especially as shown in the dress and the deportment of young ladies) since his own childhood; for his complaints are no less forcible than those of to-day.

Born shortly before William the Conqueror landed in England, Guibert was a distinguished representative of an extremely interesting age, and this autobiography gives us a very vivid picture, not only of his contemporaries, but of the social and political movements that had begun to arise before his death in 1124.

In a notice of *Il Concilio Vaticano*, by Dr. E. Campano, recently published at Lugano, the *Universe* says:

The present volume, which has nearly a thousand pages, deals with the atmosphere around the Council, the opposition the Council met with outside the Church amongst Protestants and Freemasons, and the agitation it caused amongst Cath-

olics, in several countries, especially Germany and France. A second volume dealing with the inner story of the Council will be published later on. The author confesses in the introduction that the result of his important historical researches on the Council has been an increase of admiration for the saintly Pius IX., for his wisdom in assembling the Council, and his courage in fighting the errors of modern Rationalism and Catholic Liberalism.

British Catholics will be glad to be reminded of the importance of the English-speaking Bishops in the Vatican Council. They were more numerous than the French or Spanish Bishops, and were only outnumbered by the Italians. There were (counting the U. S. A.) over 110, out of whom only 27 were averse from the definition of Papal Infallibility. It was the Archbishop of Dublin, Cardinal Cullen, who wrote the actual formula of Papal Infallibility that was voted by the Council. According to Professor Campana the most influential person in the entire Council was an Englishman, Cardinal Manning. "It is no exaggeration to say," writes Professor Campana, "that Manning occupies in the Vatican Council a place which reminds us of the place occupied by St. Cyril in the Council of Ephesa." Professor Campana is of opinion that, though the immense majority of the Bishops were in favor of the definition of Papal Infallibility, it is humanly speaking not sure whether without the help of Cardinal Manning the dogma of Papal Infallibility would ever have been voted at all. It is, at any rate, Manning who, through his relations with Odo Russell, prevented the intervention of the British Government against the Council. It was, moreover, his great speech of May 28 in the Council that had a decisive influence on many of the hesitant Fathers.

Abbot Butler is at present engaged on a book upon the Council with special reference to Archbishop Ullathorne's influence. Those who wish to supplement it with a work of larger scale and wider scope will do well to have recourse to Prof. Campana's present large work and the volume that will succeed it.

W. I. L. in *America* (January 15) says of H. L. Mencken's *Notes on Democracy:* The book is a gross caricature of American democracy—all shadows with no sunlight, for though the closing pages hint that democracy has some merits, the few that are vaguely indicated are of questionable worth. . . . There is a saying that a man's worst enemies are those of his own household. *Notes on Democracy* summons practical democracy before the infallible Mencken tribunal and spares from the attacks of a vitriolic pen scarcely any of its phases, any department of Government and few public men and movements. Wholesale condemnations and platitudinous charges are easy to make and even to bolster up with a semblance of evidence, but the incomplete presentation of a cause is as false and deceptive as a positive misstatement. The vulgarities that frequently characterize Mr. Mencken's writings are not absent from this volume. Too often the author plays fast and loose with many of the ordinary decencies of life and he goes out of his way blasphemously to insult a great body of the American public. Mr. Mencken is a popular but not an authoritative writer. Even his scintillating pen cannot compensate for much exaggeration, much flippancy and

much rank philosophy, nor does it justify his vogue. He serves his readers the shadow for the substance and theatrical trappings for the realities of life.

Learning How to Study and Work Effectively, by William Frederick Book (Ginn and Company, Boston and New York) is a very practical and useful volume and explains quite attractively how to utilize individual endowments and environment; the part played by habit in learning how to work effectively; how to conserve energy and time, and use both effectively.

It is designed to meet the needs of both college Juniors and non-academics who desire to make the best possible use of inherent abilities and time.

English Prose and Poetry, by John Matthews Manly (Ginn and Company, Boston and New York) is an enlarged and improved edition of Professor Manly's earlier anthology.

"The New Age," as Professor Manly aptly terms the present period, includes, in the revised edition, selections from the work of Alice Meynell, Moore, Wilde, Shaw, Gissing, Thompson, Newbolt, Kipling, Yeats, Dowson, "A. E.," Conrad, Jacks, Wells, Bennett, Galsworthy, Davies, Belloc, Synge, Hodgson, Masefield, De la Mare, Chesterton, G. Lowes Dickinson, Noyes, Flecker, Lawrence, Brooke, Thomas, Munro, Strachey, Campbell, Colum, Stephens, and Drinkwater.

The appearance of the volume is attractive, the type is clear, well spaced, and legible, and the fine quality of thin paper makes the book of convenient size. The table of contents greatly aids the teacher and the pupil in the study of authors and their positions in literary history. It also reveals the wide scope and great amount of material accessible in this one volume.

Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., is reported to have added two more great discoveries to his astonishing record in the patristic field. But since his monumental edition of St. Jerome some years ago he has had a strangely adventurous career. A French Benedictine attached to the Belgian monastery of Maredsous, he was doing research work in Munich in 1914. Marooned in Germany, his scholarly attainments gave him a certain immunity among many admirers and devoted friends; and when reckless Allied propagandists published statements to the effect that Germany was a pagan country, Dom Morin expressed in print his frank admission that Germany had more practicing Catholics than France. His indiscretion produced a storm in France, and he went to Fribourg, in Switzerland, after the war. Hostility followed him there and he removed to Zurich, where he discovered other important old manuscripts, and the Protestant University gave him an honorary degree. This incensed his critics still more, and he went on to Italy, where he has now discovered two hitherto unknown sermons by St. Augustine in the Ambrosian Library at Milan.

A reviewer in the *Nation*, says of Cuthbert Wright's *The Story of the Catholic Church:* This volume lacks learning, an insight into the moving laws of human history, reconstructive power, a title indicative of content, and an index. What is left, after all these deficiencies are accounted for, is an impressionist sketch of

some picturesque details of Roman ecclesiasticism. The book is evidently founded on the time-honored Greenwich Village assumption that susceptible nerves and a thin, newspapery sort of education are the sole prerequisites of writing "de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis."

The Reformation in Northern England, by J. S. Fletcher, Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, Member of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, author of the *Making of Modern Yorkshire*, *Yorkshiremen of the Restoration*, *Memorials of the Yorkshire Parish*, and the *Cistercians in Yorkshire* (George Allen & Unwin, Ruskin House, 40 Museum Street, London, W.C.1, England) gives a rude jolt to the common tradition that the Reformation was a blessing to the English nation. The author proves that it was the contrary. "We have," he says, "become so indoctrinated, so permeated, so possessed by the misrepresentations of prejudiced popular history, written by paid partisans in defence of political Protestantism, that many of us find it hard to understand the actual condition of things at the time of the Reformation. It has become an accepted tradition that our forerunners of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were weary of their religion, and gladly welcomed the upheaval under Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth. There was no such weariness and no such gladness in the North of England, whatever may have been in certain districts of the South. The changes effected in the Northern Province during the sixteenth century were accomplished in direct opposition to the will of the people. . . .

Under the title, *Religion and Common Sense*, Father Martin J. Scott, S.J., (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York) has published another volume of apologetic purport. This volume has not the unity of certain other of his works in so far as it deals with such disparate subjects as War, Amusements, Birth Control, and the Future Life. However, as a compilation of essays, characterized by clear exposition, plain diction and dignified forcefulness, it should prove useful to the many thousands of people whom the late newspaper questionnaire have shown to be interested in religion. E. R. B.

Lift Up Your Hearts, by Father Lasance (Benziger Bros., New York) is a book of mental and vocal prayer for men and women who take a serious view of life, "whose aim is to reproduce in themselves the virtues of our divine Master and model." It is a useful and practical volume, of attractive format, not bulky, though it contains nearly nine hundred pages.

The London correspondent of the New York *World* (October 9) states: With the sale recently of the last Gutenberg Bible still in private hands by the Benedictine monks at the St. Paul monastery in Carinthia to Otto H. Vollbehr of New York, another of the world's rare literary treasures goes to America. The sale price is reported to have been $280,000, more than double the price ($106,000) which was considered a record one for a printed book, which the famous Melk copy brought last spring at a public sale. It is just a year since Edward Gold-

ston, the London bookseller, aroused such interest in the book world by securing a copy from the Benedictine monastery for something like $60,000.

The St. Paul Bible was originally at the Benedictine monastery at St. Basien in Baden, Germany, and was taken to Carinthia during the Napoleonic wars. The Bible is printed on vellum and contains 42 lines to a column.

The first Gutenberg Bible to America was bought in 1847 by James Lenox for $2,500, and now is in the New York Public Library. Another copy of the famous bibliographical treasure is in the New York General Theological Seminary, while two copies are in the library of J. Pierpont Morgan. Counting the Melk couy in Yale Library, at least seven copies are now known to be in the United States.

Seventy-nine copies, or fragments of copies of this Latin Bible, which was among the first productions of the printing press in Europe, are recorded as having survived the havoc of nearly five centuries.

The whereabouts of 41 complete copies are known. Of these 12 copies are on vellum, of which the St. Paul copy is one, out of an edition which may have consisted of 180 paper and 30 vellum copies.

Eight copies of the Gutenberg Bible are known to be in England; the British Museum possessing two copies, and the Bodleian, John Aylands, Eton College, Lambeth, and the Edinburgh Advocates' Libraries each one copy. Another copy is said to be in the possession of the Earl of Carysfort at Elton.

Paris possesses three copies of the Bible, while Germany heads the list with 12.

The first copy of this famous Bible to attract attention was one in the library of Cardinal Mazarin, the French statesman of the seventeenth century, who not only threw his great library open to literary men, but pensioned all their leaders, including Descartes, Balzac, and Pierre Corneille. It is to this fact that the Bible owes its popular name of "Mazarin" Bible.

To biographers it is known as the "42-line Bible," from the number of lines to a printed column, a name which serves to distinguish it from another one printed about the same time and styled for a similar reason the "36-line Bible." The latter Bible is rarer still, only about 12 copies—all on paper—being preserved, of which one perfect copy is in the possession of the John Rylands Library, Manchester.

Neither Bible gives any definite information as to the place of printing, the name of the printers or the date. The City of Mainz has been generally recognized as the place where both Bibles were printed, although there is still a difference of opinion upon the point.

There also is a difference of opinion with regard to the printer. The name of Johann Gutenberg has been suggested by some authorities; by others it is assumed that Johann Fust, to whom Gutenberg was originally indebted for financial assistance after he had perfected the new method of typography, and his son-in-law, Peter Schoeffer, were mainly responsible for it.

As for the date, the evidence of a note left by the rubricator of a copy preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, points to the assumption that the famous Bible was completed some time before August 24, 1456.

Poor Gutenberg! He could not even find the money to set up his first press and afterward got into trouble and was sued at law because he could not refund the goldsmith the money he had advanced. How amazed he would have been had any one foretold that in the year 1926 his Bible would be in the front rank of the world's treasures and would be sold from an Austrian monastery for the vast sum of $280,000!

The former professor of ecclesiastical history in the St. Paul Seminary, the Rev. Dr. Francis J. Schaefer, now pastor of St. Mary's Church, Sleepy-Eye, Minnesota, has given us an entertaining story of the Catholic faith in that parish in his *Golden Jubilee of St. Mary's Parish* (New Ulm, Minn., 1926). The volume (p. 151) gives a view of the past fifty years in the curiously named little town and in the diocese to which it belongs. The first chapter sketches the history of the Diocese of St. Paul and is based upon the articles which Dr. Schaefer contributed on the same subject to the *Catholic Encyclopedia* and the *Acta et Dicta*, the official organ of the St. Paul Catholic Historical Society. The book is well written; all historical facts are well substantiated by documents or by creditable traditions; and all in all Dr. Schaefer has furnished us with a model parochial history—something we have been searching for a long time.

P. G.

Some Cross-Bearers of the Finger Lakes Region is the modest title of a delightful history of the Church in and around Albany, Utica, Rochester, Auburn, Salina, and Aurora, by the Rev. Bernard L. Hefferman. The main interest of the book is in the rise and progress of the Faith in Aurora, Cayuga County, New York, but the range of Father Hefferman's researches was much wider and the result of his studies leads him from the earliest Jesuit missionaries of New York to the present. There is a chapter filled with pathos on the passing of Father Michael O'Gorman, who was the first priest to visit that part of the State and who died at an early age, worn out by the strain of the missionary work. Apart from the attractive style and dress of the book, there is revealed an amazing amount of research which does credit to the author's historical zeal and judgment.

P. G.

Students of American history are to be congratulated upon the renewed publication of the *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, the first number of which is dated February-August, 1926. The *Review* is the only periodical of its kind in the English language. It was established in February, 1918, by a group of American scholars, but suspended publication in 1922, owing to the lack of financial support. Under the editorship of Dr. James A. Robertson, the twenty numbers issued between 1918 and 1922 were filled with original essays on Latin-American history, with bibliographical lists and guides, and with uncommonly good book reviews of Hispanic American historical literature. To one section of American scholarship, each issue of the *Review* carried an especial interest, for it was felt by this group that an organ of this kind could not be published with-

out displaying prejudices of a certain nature. To the credit of Dr. Robertson and his staff of writers, the *Review* was constructive, enlightening, and thoroughly scholarly. It is for this same group the *Review* should now have an outstanding appeal. Catholics of the United States, as was easily evidenced recently, have meagre acquaintance with their Church below the Rio Grande, with a hierarchy and priesthood two and a half centuries older than their own, Catholic Americans should welcome the reappearance of the *Review* and it should be found on the reading tables of all our colleges and universities. It should be supported by all who seek for something more than a superficial knowledge of Spanish-American Catholic history. THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW wishes Dr. Robertson and his board of editors every success in their new undertaking.

P. G.

Making the Eleven. By John R. Uniack. (Benziger Brothers. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.)

Our young people have no reason to complain of a dearth of good stories. Many are written to-day, and well written, to replace the objectionable produce of an unscrupulous press. In his first boys' story, the author has depicted the adventures of Tommy Barry during his first four months at St. Michaels. He makes the Varsity team, he makes passing marks in his studies, and best of all, he makes a lasting impression for good on all with whom he comes in contact. The atmosphere of the book is stimulating, the characters are full of pep, and not so good as to be unnatural. We wish the print were a little larger. Even on young eyes it will be a strain.

J. F. L.

Schooner Ahoy! By Irving T. McDonald. (Benziger Brothers. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.)

Those who enjoyed *Hoi-ah!* will experience another thrill in reading its sequel. This time the Holy Cross boys go on an expedition during vacation with the Cape Cod Fishing Fleet. While enjoying their crazy little craft, they have many hair-breadth escapes and thrilling adventures after the Captain Kidd kind. We are pleased to have this second story from an author who seems well versed in boyology. And after all, is boyology much different from girlology? Is not psychology the open sesame to both these human mysteries? So we think that not only boys but their wideawake sisters will read with interest this tale. Both boys and girls enjoy fairy tales. Both have found in *Alice in Wonderland* a perennial charm. The two sexes make no discrimination with Stevenson and Kipling. Why should they not relish the air of mystery with which Irving McDonald's island and Antone de Costa are wrapped?

J. F. L.

The Independence Square Neighborhood. Philadelphia. 1926. Pp. 155.

The Sesquicentennial celebration in Philadelphia has inspired many accounts of the past century and a half of American life. None possess more charm than this volume; few surpass it in beauty. It is filled with photogravures of rare

old prints and daguerrotypes, long since forgotten; and with its charming narrative the past lives again as in no other book of its kind. Catholic Philadelphians will rejoice to find in its pages the story of old St. Joseph's and St. Mary's, the figure of the Father of the American Navy, Captain John Barry, and the story of Evangeline and Gabriel, who lie in peace awaiting the Resurrection in the little Catholic graveyard which still remains an unbroken link with the past amid towering buildings that speak of modern times.

P. G.

NOTES AND COMMENT

The Universal Knowledge Foundation.—The Universal Knowledge Foundation has issued an attractive booklet, *The New Literature.* From its contents we cull the following:

The world needs respect for authority, reverence for law, the sanctity of the home, fidelity to the marriage bond, regard for human life before as well as after birth, parental responsibility, juvenile self-control, education in religion, an end to class conflicts, integrity in public life and in business, restraint in pleasure, decency in the theatre, less license in literature, and moderation as against the fanaticism which is intolerant of genuine liberty.

If there is any definite public opinion about Catholics it is this precisely that we have all these things, and that by virtue of them we are a force for good in every community. The very breath of our nostrils is authority, reverence for law, genuine home life, marital fidelity, the only defensible method of birth control, and all the other things the world so sadly needs.

Now here precisely is where we fail to do our part for the world about us. We are forever boasting that our principles and traditions would save mankind in our present evil conditions, yet what are we doing to impart what we possess in such abundance?

. . . . . .

History can be made readable and yet stress principles of philosophy, of ethics, of economics, of political science. Fiction nowadays is mostly a conveyance for some view, theory of life or code of conduct the author favors. Biography affords the widest scope for discussing ideals, principles, policies without formally obtruding religion. Then there are books of travel sadly needed from Catholic pens, and the new literature of exploration, not of lands and rivers only, but of the manners, customs, habits of little known peoples. Even philosophy, most of all psychology, can be made an interesting part of literature. The more abstruse science is the more it needs popularizing. The alleged difference between science and religion disappears when both are stated in terms that all can understand. Humor and poetry also are potent as makers of opinion, and above all, genuine criticism, not faultfinding merely nor carping, but constructive criticism, the one art in which we should excel.

. . . . . .

The Universal Knowledge Foundation (the only Foundation in the United States which has a distinctly Catholic purpose) is supported by popular subscription and is on a strictly cöoperative basis.

The movement aims to create a Catholic literature—a literature of life—which will meet not merely the need of remedies for evils of the day, but also those higher needs of mankind, of justice, of solid mutual trust and affection, of devotion to the highest ideals, and of religion as the dominant factor in human life.

The Foundation has already gathered abundant material for the publications it plans to issue, and has actually in press the first volume of an entirely new

general reference work, new in style and new in content, not on religious subjects only, but on every subject of human interest. The editors consider it essential to publish this work as the basis of all their publications, because there is in English no reliable, complete and up-to-date general reference work. Even the thirty-two volumes of the Britannica, announced now as a new edition, are as they were written some years before the war. The new general reference work, entitled *Universal Knowledge*, will illustrate what the new literature should be in style and content, and how, under Catholic auspices, the whole round of knowledge may be presented in a manner to suit every eader of whatever creed, or even the creedless. As all the preliminary work on this publication has been done, the first volume is already in press, and the other volumes will follow one another in quick succession. Important as this work is, it is only one item in the program of the Foundation.

The movement in process means much for Catholics in this and in every English-speaking country. It will soon put an end to the superstition that we are an alien body, a menace to our political institutions, a people of divided allegiance. It will help to bring religion back into public life.

Catholicism in Scotland.—In March of next year (March 4, 1928), the golden jubilee of the Scottish Hierarchy will be observed.

According to Major Shepard, writing in the *Universe* (London) there have been four Scots cardinals, for Cardinal Henry Stuart, Duke of York and brother of Prince Charles Edward, "The Pretender," must be regarded as a Scot, even if a Roman by birth.

But the Cardinal Duke does not seem to have ever set foot in the "land of brown heath and shaggy wood." Cardinal Erskine, his contemporary, who died in 1811, may have been in Scotland, but it was only on a flying visit, if at all. He, too, was born in Rome, of a Scots father and an Italian mother; but he was educated at the Scots College. He visited England on a special Vatican mission to George III., and no doubt crossed the Tweed before he returned. It is true also that he was made Cardinal Protector of the Scots College.

We have to go back four hundred years, however, to find the last Cardinal who was a Scot vested with an episcopal jurisdiction in Scotland. That was Cardinal Beaton, Arch-bishop of St. Andrews. To find another Scots Cardinal identified with a Scottish see and a member of the Scottish Hierarchy, we have to go back 540 years, apparently, to Cardinal Wardlaw, Bishop of Glasgow.

Scotland's zeal in the cause of religion has been noteworthy. Cross the border from England by the westerly route and one sees in the distance the heights of Galloway hallowed by St. Ninian, the founder of Candida Casa. A little further on, skirting the ruins of Lincluden Abbey, one reaches Dumfries, the seat to-day of the successor of St. Ninian. Pass into Scotland on the east side, and see the homes of the sainted abbots of Melrose, Kelso, Jedburgh, and Dryburgh.

Penetrate to Glasgow and be reminded of St. Bride of Bothwell, almost on the threshold of St. Kentigern's city—a city teeming with life, teaching, manufacturing, building, and preaching for the world. A cathedral hoary with age rises upon the shrine where the bones of St. Kentigern were interred after he

had planted the Faith which inspired a succession of learned Bishops and Catholic kings to build up—under the favor of the Popes, who created the University and established the Glasgow fair—the greatness of this second city of the British Empire.

Somewhere in the hallowed neighborhood of that venerable Cathedral is the ground made sacred by the feet of St. Kentigern and St. Columba, who, with their followers, held conference here as to how they might best do God's work in this northern kingdom.

One need only study the posters advertising railway excursions from Glasgow to recall the vigorous life of Catholic Scotland. There is Dunfermline, in whose abbey grounds rests the dust of St. Margaret, Queen and Patroness, and St. Andrews, where St. Regulus established the Church. There is Holyrood, which owes its origin to the miraculous escape of St. David, King of Scotland. St. Monan, St. Finbar, St. Barr, St. Brendan, St. Marnock, St. Chattan, St. Kenneth, St. Cuthbert, are all great saints who lived or worked with countless others of their kind in this ancient realm.

If one more may be mentioned, who should it be but the great St. Patrick, born in the civil parish which has been named Kilpatrick after him, in which parish the present-day successor of St. Kentigern has taken up his abode, and in which the diocesan seminary of Glasgow has been established?

If one thinks on to the earlier post "Reformation" days, the first vision that arises is of the old market place of Glasgow filled with the crowd of sightseers, witnesses of the death of the Venerable John Ogilvie in defence of the spiritual authority of the Pope three hundred years ago.

The holy benisons of those sainted Scots missionaries and apostles hover over the land. Two hundred years ago there were, according to a report to Propaganda, only 14,000 Catholics in all Scotland; now more than 20,000 Catholic children are baptized in Scotland each year.

One hundred and fifty years ago Catholics dared not assemble or they would be mobbed and beaten, as they were in Glasgow when Fr. Robert Menzies, of Edinburgh, in 1778, had to escape from a murderous mob in a Sedan chair.

Now there are at least 600,000 Catholics in Scotland; Mass is said in about 450 churches and chapels; there are 262 organized missions; convents and monasteries again have become centers of religious activity; 210 Catholic schools, spread the light of the Catholic faith; 620 priests minister to the spiritual needs of their growing flocks; two colleges are devoted to the training of priests; two archbishops and five bishops ordain new priests, consecrate new bishops, confirm young Catholics, and supervise the great work of Catholicising Scotland once more.

Book-Lovers in the Ages of Faith.—Through the courtesy of the editor of the *Catholic Gazette*—the scholarly organ of the Catholic Missionary Society of the Archdiocese of Westminister—we are enabled to reproduce the following article by Miss Marian Nesbitt:

Perhaps there are few facts that strike the average modern reader more forcibly when studying that period of history known as the Middle Ages, than

the high value set upon books, and the scrupulous regard for their safe custody. But it should always be remembered that during the Ages of Faith, religion was not as it is for so many at the present time, either a diseased self-introspection and agonising inquiry, or a matter of complete indifference, or merely an outworn creed quite beneath the attention of thinking minds!

In those days men's duties were clear to them; the way of supreme good plain, indisputable, and they were travelling on it. Religion lay over them like an all-embracing, heavenly canopy, like an atmosphere and life element, which was not spoken of, yet in all things pre-supposed without speech.

Even if we go back still earlier to the very dawn of Christianity, we realise that it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the work done by the Church in making, collecting and preserving books. Indeed, the immense value set upon them is sufficiently proved by the many regulations concerning them.

Needless to say, the Successors of St. Peter have ever been generous patrons of learning. Besides universities, they have founded a number of libraries (the most celebrated being the Vatican), and enriched them with manuscripts and documents of the greatest value. Pope Damasus, whose pontificate lasted from 366 to 384, built in Rome a record-office, which also served as a library. Each church also became, with its service-books, Gospels, etc., the nucleus of a library; and we read that when he was dying, "St. Augustine directed that the library of the church and all the books should be carefully kept for posterity for ever." (*Possidius, "Vita Aug."* n. 31.)

Pope Agapitus, in 535-36, ordered the erection on the Coelian Hill of a building for the keeping of books, which was afterwards known as the Library of St. Gregory. The friend of Agapitus, the famous Cassiodorus, having retired from the world towards the close of his life, founded a library in the religious community which he established in Southern Italy, and decreed that the brethren should make copies of any book that he desired. By this means he speedily increased the number of works and the value of the library which contained them.

The hermits of the desert had books; and as far back as the time of St. Pachomius, the books were kept in a cupboard in the thickness of the wall. Nuns, too, had books and libraries. One of the members of the community used to distribute the books at the hours set apart for reading; it was, moreover, the duty of this Sister to collect them afterwards. Study, and especially the study of Holy Scripture, occupied a prominent place in the lives of women consecrated to God. They spent daily a prescribed time, not only in reading, but also in transcribing; some of them were, in fact, noted scribes at an early period.

The mention of scribes, reminds us that, in England, after the revival of letters which followed the Conquest, writing-rooms or *scriptoria* formed henceforward a part of every religious house of any standing. In fact, it was in such noted *scriptoria* as those of Hexham, Canterbury, Peterborough, and others, that the chief works of Latin literature, Patristic or Classical, were copied and illuminated, the lives of the Saints compiled, and entries noted in the monastic chronicle.

Before the introduction of Scriptoria, the religious of our great monastic houses practically lived, studied, and wrote in the cloister, the four walks of which may be truly said to have formed the dwelling-place of the community. When, therefore, we bend in wondering admiration over those exquisite monuments of the monastic writer's skill in copying and illuminating—monuments undertaken, as we know, simply for the glory of God and the good of their brethren, and never to foster self-gratification or personal ambition—we are lost in astonishment at the courage and endurance of the men who accomplished such tasks to all intents and purposes out of doors, amidst the cold and damp of our Northern winters; for no method of heating the picturesque stone cloisters had yet been invented; it was not till some time after the Norman Conquest that writing-rooms became a necessary part of every important monastery; whilst the Middle Ages were well advanced ere the practice of gathering the books of the house together, and arranging them in one place, became at all general.

St. Benedict Biscop, who died in 690, made several journeys to Rome to obtain proper church furniture and books for his six hundred monks. When Abbot of Wearmouth, he formed a valuable and very complete library which, at his death, was divided between Wearmouth and Jarrow, the two monasteries he had founded in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul.

We are told by the Venerable Bede that Bishop Acca, "who succeeded St. Wilfrid in the bishopric of the church of Hagulstad, erected a most numerous and noble library." We learn also that Acca "was a most expert singer, as well as most learned in Holy Writ, most pure in the confession of the Catholic Faith, and most observant on the rules of ecclesiastical institution." (*"Bede's Ecclesiastical History,"* ch. xx, 276.)

No reference, however, to libraries would be complete without an acknowledgment of the still greater debt owed by Britain to those first fervent Irish missionary monks, who gave the English the alphabet and the Christian Faith; for neither at Jarrow nor at Wearmouth was there a great scriptorium with a staff of trained copyists like that at Lindisfarne. Now Lindisfarne was a Celtic foundation, following the Irish traditions. Scholars flourished there—Irish scholars, true lovers of learning, and capable of any study to which they might devote their minds. As a matter of fact, letters, science and the skilled arts had come to them direct from the Continent, to be altered and adapted by their own genius. For St. Columban and many other of Erin's pilgrim monks never ceased to travel over Europe in search of knowledge—knowledge which the quick-witted Celts were more than competent to turn to the greatest advantage. From the days of St. Patrick they were strenuous in their efforts to foster learning in France, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere.

In our own country, by the middle of the eighth century, Northumbria had become the literary centre of the world in Western Europe, owing to the labours of Irish missionaries to our shores. Bede the Venerable, the father of our national education, undoubtedly derived, in the first instance from Celtic sources, that special trend of thought which was eventually to develop in so wonderful a way.

Impossible here to describe the famous libraries of Reichenau, Fulda, Corvey, and others in Germany; of Fleury, Corbie, etc., in France. All these possessed very valuable volumes in large quantities, and these were duly catalogued.

At Durham before the great library was built above the cloisters the many hundreds of books were kept in presses or cupboards; some were stored in the church, some in the refectory, and others in different parts of the cloister. At Christ Church, Canterbury, there were 1,850 books and about 1452 the Prior, Thomas Gladstone, finished a library, whose nucleus was formed of the volumes St. Augustine brought with him from Rome, together with those of Archbishop Theodore. Canterbury also, in all probability, inherited the treasures of Reculver, a neighbouring monastery that possessed very precious manuscripts. Among them were the celebrated Utrecht Psalter, also another beautiful specimen of early palaeographic art, known as "The Evangelia of King Canute"— a Latin MS. of the Gospels, in which at the beginning of St. Mark's narrative, are most interesting entries relating to that King. These entries would seem to be a certificate of Canutes' reception as an associate of, or rather a proof of his affiliation to, the religious of the Canterbury monastery. A copy of the Latin Gospels with *Umfridus me fecit* on the fly-leaf, was also presented to Christ Church by King Athelstan.

Canterbury possesses yet another most precious example of Anglo-Saxon caligraphy and illumination, called "The Gospels of St. Augustine's Abbey," to which house, as we see by an inscription on the fly-leaf, it belonged in the fourteenth century. The library at Canterbury built by Archbishop Chichele, was over the prior's chapel; those at Clairvaux and Citeaux over the scriptorium; that at Durham over the old cloister. In Paris, the Augustinian library in the monastery of St. Victor, was over the south cloister. At Oxford, the Friars Minor had two libraries in their friary. At Bury St. Edmunds at the beginning of the fifteenth century the monks had as many as 2,000 books.

From Abingdon came the first permission to lend books to persons outside of the monastery on receipt of a pledge that they should be faithfully returned. We find this same practice of lending in some of the French monasteries, and also decrees concerning the duty of so doing. In some monastic houses it was considered a positive act of charity to lend books; truly a corporal work of mercy in the case of poor students who had no means of obtaining them, and one, moreover, which must have contributed in no small degree to the spread of knowledge.

In conclusion, it may be added that the great library at Wells had twenty-five windows on each side! That of the Grey Friars in London was 129 feet long by 31 feet broad, and was well-filled with books. The Priory of Dover, and the Abbey of Leicester, had each also a goodly store.

The Eastern Problem.—In view of recent pronouncements of Pius XI and the establishment in this country of the "Catholic Near East Welfare Association" the following address given by the Very Rev. Canon Myers, M. A. (president of St. Edmunds College, Ware) at the inaugural meeting of the Society of St. John

Chrysostom, held at Westminster, under the presidency of Cardinal Bourne, has special significance:

> The Society of St. John Chrysostom owes its origin to a meeting of English Catholics held in Rome on January 13th last. They had heard the criticism that English Catholics appeared to have no interest in all that was being undertaken on behalf of the Christians of the East, that whenever Catholic workers appeared on the scenes in the East, English and American workers were there, but always working against Communion with the Holy See. They realised that it was unsound that the prestige of the English race and of the English tongue should be monopolised by non-Catholics, and that it was important that our fellow-Catholics abroad should be brought to realise that we Catholics in England were one with them in striving for Unity.
>
> A preliminary meeting in London led to the formation of a Provisional Committee, which has agreed on a line of action to be taken without delay. Our primary concern is with the Unity of Christ's Church—surrounded as it is today with groups of Christians who are out of communion with the divinely-established centre of union. Recriminations as to the past will do no good, insinuations and accusations will do more harm than good.
>
> The objects of the Society are:—
>
> 1. To work and pray that religious misunderstandings may be dissipated from the minds of all sincere believers in the teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ.
>
> 2. To foster interest in all works, approved by the Holy See, making for a better understanding of the problem of the Christian East.
>
> 3. To study and to make better known the historical and dogmatic implications of the Great Eastern Liturgies.
>
> 4. To keep well in mind the outstanding Eastern problem of Islam.
>
> Our purpose is a peaceful one not a controversial one. Prayer for unity we are never to forget. Prayer for unity within these islands, prayer for unity throughout the world, conscious as we are how irresistible would be the power for good were all who believed in the Divine Teaching of Our Lord Jesus Chrst united—as Our Lord Prayed that they should be. Our more immediate concern is work for those Eastern Christians who in the course of ages have ceased to be in communion with Rome. This work is not a matter of mere personal preference, nor merely a matter of actual pressing need: Pope after Pope in the life-time of those here present—Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI—have all pursued the same ideal of unity and urged it on the faithful. But never at any period of the world's history has such a providential opportunity of fruitful work for the East been offered to us.
>
> Let us contrast two dates, 1900 and 1925. In 1900 the great obstacles to the realization of Unity were the mighty State Church of Russia and the great Church of Constantinople. Here were other minor groups of Eastern Christians all united in traditional hostility to Rome.

And in 1925? The two great anti-Roman powers have crashed. We simply note the fact. History will record the terrible circumstances. What is really happening in Russia it is not easy to gather, but the Russian Church has suffered, and is suffering an agony that demands our prayerful sympathy. The great Church of Constantinople has practically ceased to be a centre of power; and Christian traces in Asia Minor have become fainter than ever.

Cæsaropapism and its intolerant exclusiveness did ensure that a statement of the Catholic case should never reach the ears of the hundred millions of Russians. And now these millions of Russians are scattered in painful exile over the face of the world, seeing and hearing new things hitherto undreamed of. They have a right to our help and to our sympathy, they have a right to know truths which have hitherto been withheld from them. It is our duty to present these truths to them in ways that will not repel.

In Eastern Europe new states have arisen, and old boundaries have been enlarged. New problems, political and religious, have been forced on the notice of Statesmen. Catholic minorities need the support of our known and expressed sympathies. Heterodox majorities should realise that their old-world methods of persecution are being closely watched on these shores and are being recorded.

Our purpose is irenic and not controversial. Centuries of controversies have led to a bitterness of feeling of which we in the West find it difficult to form an adequate idea—and no good comes of it. Our Lord's purpose was clear—the realisation of His commands must be the aim of East and West alike. Given sincerity, it is clear that activities militating against Our Lord's wishes must be due to some terrible misunderstanding, and that we shall seek to remove by prayer, by study, hard work, in order to see exactly the standpoint of those out of communion with the Holy See, and by sympathy.

Remember that for close on 1,000 years we have lived apart—separated geographically, politically, religiously. The intense intellectual and religious development of the West has not had a parallel counterpart in the East. Our wonderful Latin Synthesis of Dogmas, and Moral and Canon Law has influenced the life of Western nations to an extent they can with difficulty appreciate. But what of the East: what do we Westerns know of their Theology, their Moral, their Canon Law, their mentality, their psychological notions? It is common-place to assume that stagnation has characterised the whole of their history since the separation. We can all remember the time when mediæval thought was authoritatively declared to be characterised by dull, monotonous re-iteration of dead formulas: increase of knowledge has led to the appreciation of the amazing activity of mediæval thinkers. The East knows practically nothing of the Church in the West: let us be quite frank—we know as little of the actual conditions in which Eastern Christians are living their lives.

We must be prepared to take broad views covering many years—not looking for immediate results: acquiring a knowledge of facts, teaching, practices: avoiding big generalisation based upon insufficient data. The Greek Church of Constantinople, her aims and ambitions other than those which guided the Holy Synod in Russia. The Church centred in Athens must be considered in the midst of problems other than those that perplex the Orthodox in Jugoslavia, in Roumania, in Bulgaria. To gauge currents of feeling even in our own land is difficult even for a trained observer. What shall we say of the currents of feeling in lands so remote from every point of view common to the Christians of the West?

Sympathisers with the Society of St. John Chrysostom have wondered why there is no mention of Union, Reunion, Union of the Churches, Our Separated Bretheren of the East, etc. There is a good reason for avoiding them. They may sound peaceful in our English or French ears, but one of the many pitfalls besetting work for the realisation in this world of Christ's ideal for His Church is the pitfall of different connotation of words apparently similar in value, when transferred to another language. "Union" and "Reunion" and "Separated Bretheren" are all of them intensely distasteful to our Russian bretheren. "Union" and "Uniate" connote to them—wrongly maybe—Polish and anti-national political activities. "Separated Brethren" in English implies and is accepted as conveying kindly sentiments; to the Russian it suggests "Schismatic." Our French fellow-Catholics find no difficulty in speaking of "The Union of the Churches." They never think or speak of their politically powerful Protestant fellow-countrymen as forming a "Church." To them the Union of the Churches refers to the distant Churches of the East. To us "the Churches" sounds less pleasingly with its suggestion of the hundred warring sects in the midst of which we live, and their appeals to "Our Common Christianity."

Irish Forerunners of Dante.—Rev. D. O'Mahony, B.D., B.C.L., writes in the Catholic Times (London):

"The virgin island of Erin," writes Ozanam in his *Germanic Studies* (Paris, 1847), "on whose soil no proconsul had ever set his foot, which had known neither the exactions of Rome nor its orgies, was also the only spot in the whole world of which the Gospel took possession without resistance and without bloodshed. The first fervours of the faith which in other lands drove the Christians to martyrdom, drew the neophytes of Ireland into monasteries, and St. Patrick rejoiced to see the sons and daughters of the chiefs of the clans ranging themselves under the rule of the cloister in such numbers that he could no longer count them." Cardinal Moran, in his *"Occasional Papers"* (Dublin, 1890), writes that 130 Irish saints have found a place in the calendars of Germany; 45 are honoured as patrons in France; 30 in Belgium, and several others in Italy, Switzerland, and even in remote Iceland. Numerous vestiges of Irish saints on the Continent are described in Margaret Stoke's interesting books

entitled *Six Months in the Apennines* (London 1892) and *Three Months in the Forests of France* (London 1895).

St. Columban, with his twelve companions from Bangor, laboured for twenty years at Luxeuil, making it spiritually the brightest spot in the Frankish territory. Even though she cites Mabillon, Miss Stokes is misleading when she supplies the names of all twelve of Columban's companions; St. Athala (Attalus), Columban's successor as abbot of Bobbio, appears to have been a Burgundian, not an Irishman. One of Columban's monks from Bangor was St. Dichuil (in Latin Deicola, and in French Déel or Desle), who as the apostle of the district of Lure, is still remembered in the diocese of Besancon. The Rev. S. Baring-Gould suggests that among the Irish companions of St. Columban and St. Gall is to be numbered St. Beatus, the anchorite of Lake Thun, in Switzerland, who must not be confused with an earlier St. Beatus (called also in French Béat or Bié), the apostle of Vendôme and of Laon, nor with the hermit of Beatenberg near Coblenz.

Columban had much conflict with the Frankish bishops over the disciplinary questions of the Easter reckoning and the exemption of his monasteries from diocesan episcopal jurisdiction; and in these disputes, as well as in later controversies, notwithstanding his saintliness, or perhaps because of his saintliness, he used language not always mild and gentle. His teaching on the sacrament of penance is of special interest to students of theology; and very important are also his letters to the Popes, in which he testifies to the authority of the Roman Pontiffs over all the churches of the whole world. Love of beasts and birds was a characteristic which St. Columban and St. Gall shared with St. Francis of Assisi.

In and below Picardy are many vestiges of Irish saints of the seventh century. Amongst those saints, besides St. Fiacre and some nine others already mentioned as still commemorated in Belgium, there were St. Caidoc (called also Caidan), St. Fricor, St. Corbican, St. Mauguille (or Madelgis), St. Mumbolus, St. Aemilian; St. Gobain (in Irish, Gobhan), who had hermitage in the forest of Coucy, beside the Oise, and was connected with Laon, as was also the Irish St. Bosan (Boetianus); St. Saëns (Sidonius), first abbot of the monastery which bore his name near Rouen; and St. Roding (called also Ronyn, Rouin, and Rovinter), who preached the Gospel in the Argonne forest, where he founded in 642 the monastery of Beaulieu (formerly Vasloge); and, in the eighth century, St. Moenan, an abbot at Péronne. The most conspicuous place among all the Irish saints of Picardy is held by St. Fursey. A full account of his life and visions has been written by the Venerable Bede. St. Fursey built a monastery at Lagny-sur-Marne, near Chelles, about six miles north of Paris, and was buried about the year 650 at Péronne, whither he had brought with him from Ireland relics of St. Beon and St. Meldon, two Irishmen who had never lived at Péronne. Margaret Stokes supplies a condensed translation of the Visions of St. Fursey, from the Codex Salmanticensis, now in the Royal Library, Brussels, and formerly belonging to the Irish College at Salmanca. "Tracing the course of thought upwards through the visions of Alberic and Owain Miles, and the other compositions of a like nature," says Sir Francis Palgrave in his *History of*

Normandy and England (London, 1851), "we have no difficulty in deducing the poetic genealogy of Dante's *Inferno* and *Purgatorio* to the Milesian Fursey."

It has been wrongly claimed by some authorities that St. Deodatus (in French Dié), who gives his name to a town and diocese in France, was an Irishman. There was another St. Deodatus, of the eighth century, a monk at St. Fursey's monastery at Lagny.

A quaint history attaches to an earlier Irishman, St. Tressan. With his six brothers and three sisters, he came from Ireland early in the sixth century, and probably after sojourning for some time in Brittany, came to France, settling as a cowherd at Mareille-sur-Marne, and was later ordained a priest by St. Remi (Remigius). One of his brothers, St. Gibrian, settled where the rivulet Côle flows into the Marne; his remains were later removed from there to the Abbey Church of St. Remi, in Rheims, where they rested till the French Revolution. Another of his brothers was St. Abran, who also settled as a hermit on the Marne.

On the advice of St. Boniface, the Irish St. Abel was appointed to the archbishopric of Rheims in 744. Still more remarkable, says Dom L. Gougaud, O. S. B., the bishopric of Angoulême was filled by the Irishman Tomianus in the seventh century, and by the Irishman Helias in the ninth century. An Irish anchorite, also named St. Helias (in Irish, Ailell), was elected abbot of the monastery of St. Martin at Cologne in 1004.

Three Irish saints of the twelfth century died and were buried in France—St. Malachy O'Morgair, Archbishop of Armagh, St. Concord or Cornelius (in Irish, Conchobhar McConchailleadh), Archbishop of Armagh and St. Laurence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin. St. Laurence O'Toole died in 1180 at Eu, in Normandy, and his remains now rest beside those of the Counts of Eu in the crypt of the Church of Notre Dame at Eu. He was canonised in 1225, eight year before the canonisation of the Irish St. Vergilius of Salzburg. St. Concord died in 1175 in the Benedictine Priory of Lemene, near Chambéry, on his way back to Armagh from Rome. His feast is still celebrated by the Savoyards each year on June 5. St. Malachy died in 1148 in the arms of St. Bernard, and was interred, as was St. Bernard five years later, in the Abbey Church of Clairvaux. Their tombs were disturbed by the French Revolutionists. Relics of both St. Malachy and St. Bernard now repose for veneration on the high altar of the Cathedral of Troyes.

St. Malachy O'Morgair (whose surname is supposed to be the same as O'Dogherty) was canonised in 1199, the first Irishman to be canonised by Papal decree. It was owing to him that in 1142 the Cistercian Abbey of Mellifont, County Louth, was founded. St. Bernard wrote a Life of St. Malachy, of which an English version has recently been published (London, 1920). It reveals a shocking state of religion and morals in the Island of Saints in the early twelfth century, though there probably is some rhetorical exaggeration on the part of St. Bernard, who always looked at things in the strong light of his own holiness. The so-called Prophecies of St. Malachy concerning the Popes from 1143 to the end of the world, are generally regarded as spurious, but will no doubt continue to be trotted out at the election of each new Pope. There is also the remark-

able Prophecy of St. Malachy relative to Ireland. It was discovered by Mabillon in a manuscript removed in the sixteenth century from Clairvaux to the Abbey of Einsiedeln, and runs: "The Church of God in Ireland shall never fail. With terrible discipline long shall she be purified, but, afterwards, far and wide shall her magnificence shine forth in cloudless glory. And, O Ireland! do thou lift up thy head. Thy day also shall come—a day of ages! A week of centuries equalling the seven deadly sins of thy enemy, shall be numbered unto thee. Then shall thy exceeding great merits have obtained mercy for thy terrible foe, yet so as through scourages great and enduring. Thy enemies who are in thee shall be driven out and humbled, and their name taken away. But inasmuch as thou art depressed, in so much shalt thou be exalted. Thy light shall burst forth as the sun, and thy glory shall not pass away. There shall be peace and abundance within thy boundaries and beauty and strength in thy defences." Mabillon, in a letter to Blessed Oliver Plunket, favours the authenticity of this Prophecy, as do also some others.

The medieval Lives of the numerous Irish and Cambro-Irish saints connected with Brittany are rather confusing and conflicting; a few of these Lives are printed in the Rev. W. J. Rees' *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints* (Llandovery, 1853) and in his *Liber Landavensis* (Llandovery, 1840). Modern research, writes Cardinal Moran in his *Irish Saints in Great Britain* (Callan, 1903), fully justifies the Armorican tradition that has invariably pointed to Ireland as the country of several saints whose names stand prominently forth in the calendars of Wales and Brittany; the comparatively modern Welsh genealogies are not always to be trusted.

St. Brieuc (called also Brioc), who in the fifth century founded the monastery of St. Brieuc-des-Vaux, in Brittany, received much of his education in Ireland. He was born, probably in Wales, of an Irish father and a Saxon mother; though Ussher claims him as s native of Ireland. St. Samson (or Sampson), who founded the monastery of Dol, in Brittany, and attended the Second Council of Paris in 557, was, at least by his father, of Irish parentage, and spent some time in Ireland. He was a brother of St. Tathai, and is a patron saint of Caldey Island. Dating from 1879 and having many Irish associations, one of the Catholic churches in Guernsey is dedicated to St. Sampson. A friend of St. Sampson, St. Gildas the Wise, who founded the monastery of Rhuys, in Brittany, was of Irish parentage. He, too, spent some years in Ireland and was for a time regent of the School of Armagh.

St. Magloire and St. Malo were relatives of St. Samson. St. Magloire succeeded Samson as Bishop of Dol, and later settled and died in the island of Jersey, whence his relics were removed to Paris. St. Malo (called also in French, Maclou, and in Irish, Machud) gives his name to the port of St. Malo, has a church dedicated to him in Rouen, and is one of the apostles of Brittany. He is said to have been educated under St. Brendan, probably in Kerry (Ciarraighe), and to have been one of the sailor monks who sailed with Brendan (whether from Tralee, County Kerry, or from the coast of Brittany, we know not) in quest of the Land of the Blest. Later he settled in Brittany, becoming Bishop of Aleth, a place already evangelised by St. Brendan, and died there about

the year 620. The Irish Franciscan, Father Arthur O'Leary, who died in London in 1802 and has a tablet erected to his memory in St. Patrick's Church, Soho-square, lived for twenty-five years in the Franciscan Convent at St. Malo. "Alas, I have betrayed my poor country!" he is said to have exclaimed in his last illness.

St. Brendan (in Irish, Brenainn and Brandan, and in old French, Broladre and Brandaines) is a patron saint of sailors; at one time fishermen in Scotland used to cry "Brainuilt" as an invocation of St. Brendan's aid for a favorable wind. There is a fine figure of St. Brendan included in the decoration of the recently-erected chapel of St. Patrick in Portsmouth Cathedral. It is very likely that the fabulous voyage of St. Brendan was known to Dante and utilized by him for some of the scenes of his *Divina Commedia*. Latin MSS. of this marvellous voyage were in many of the Continental libraries from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries; several of those MSS. are still preserved in the National Library, Paris, and in the Vatican Library. The late Marquis of Bute submitted whether the old Irish fabulists treatment of the subject of Judas was not more tender and more truly tragic than Dante's.

Other Irish or Cambro-Irish saints of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries who were connected with Brittany and are still honoured there, include St. Maubred (Mybard), St. Maudez (called also Mawes), who was a monk at Tréguier; St. Mawgan, St. Briac, founder of the monastery of Bourbriac; St. Achebran (perhaps identical with St. Abran of Rheims), St. Germoc (an Irish prince named Germanus McGuill), St. Osmana (an Irish princess of the seventh century), St. Menou (in Latin, Menulphus), St. Sezin, St. Joavan, who succeeded his relative, St. Pol de Léon, as bishop of Léon; St. Taidoc and St. Cianan, who laboured with St. Joavan at Léon; and perhaps St. Méen (called also Maen, and in Latin Mevennus), a nephew of St. Samson and associated with him at Dol. One of the towns of Finistère takes its name from St. Renan (called also Ronan), an Irish hermit of the seventh sentury. His remains are still venerated by the Bretons at Locronan, and his legend has been sketched by Anatole Le Braz in one of his books.

St. Pedrwn (called also Pedredin, and in Latin, Petranus), an Armorican, spent his later life in Ireland, where he died in the early sixth century. His son St. Padarn (in Latin, Paternus), was brought up in Brittany, visited his father in Ireland, and spent many years in Wales; he is to be identified neither with St. Paternus (Pern), bishop of Vannes, nor with St. Paternus (Pair), bishop of Avranches.

A Catholic Institute of History.—Discussing Dr. Guilday's recently published *John Gilmary Shea* (Catholic Historical Society,—Records and Studies, Vol. XVII) *America* says editorially:

The story itself is one of the saddest ever told. But it is well that it has been told. It ought to arouse American Catholics to repair, as far as may now be possible, the negligence of the past, and to take means to insure that in future no Catholic scholar shall be hampered as Shea was throughout his whole life.

Few men have approached Shea in his genius for historical research, writes Dr. Guilday, or in his ability to bring to light scattered sources of our history. Yet to the end this great and good man was forced to eat the bitter bread of poverty. Months and even years that might have been devoted to the study of archives which have now been wholly destroyed by ignorant or vandal hands, were spent in striving for "a pittance that was barely enough to keep body and soul together." On the publication of the first volume of his history of the Catholic Church in the United States, he found that it had brought him a debt of more than $1,500. The prominence given him by the work prompted religious bigotry, and the sickly delicate scholar, then in his sixty-fourth year, was deprived of the editorial position which he held with a secular weekly journal. It is pathetic to read the letter written by him in the following year (1889) to Archbishop Corrigan, asking if there were any position open in the chancery office in Calvary Cemetery, or in any of the institutions. "I should be only too grateful to Your Grace for enabling me to obtain it."

Happily, provision was made by which the venerable scholar was able to go on with his studies in the history of the Church in the United States. But the student who today realizes what Shea did and what his unfettered genius might have accomplished, cannot think of those years devoted to hack work without bitterness. There was a great work at hand which only Shea could do, and he was not allowed to do it. Twice he had been forced to sell his very library "to preserve intact from the outside world," writes Dr. Guilday, "the secret of the grinding poverty that encompassed him," and on his deathbed, Georgetown University purchased his great collecteion of 30,000 books and documents by "a generous arrangement that helped him to face death more easily."

The past cannot be undone, but foresight can prevent a repetition of the errors of the past. As Shea himself recognized, there is a vast field of history which has as yet hardly been touched. If the Church is to take her merited place in the life of this country, Catholic scholars must enter that field; indeed, they alone can work it properly. But the lot of the historian today is hardly more inviting than when Shea "toiled for a pittance." We cripple him when we ask him to toil in the fetters of want. Can we not make provision for an Institute for Historical Studies at the Catholic University, with an endowment to support research workers, publish their findings, and by degrees train a group of scholars dedicated to the history of the Church in this country?

Doubtless similar proposals have been made, only to be forgotten. But there is enough money among American Catholics to establish this foundation, and we believe that they will do so if the project is brought and kept before their attention. There is hardly a greater need in the Catholic academic world today. We have made notable progress in literature and science, but with the exceptions of works by Dr. Guilday, Father Thomas Hughes, S. J., Dr. Zwierlein, and a few others, we have little to offer in history. It is to be hoped that the story of John Gilmary Shea will quicken us into realization that we American Catholics can and must come to the aid of historical research. Let us have an endowed Catholic Institute for Historical Studies.

"Straw-Balloting the Bible."—The *Dearborn Independent* says under this caption:

Little purpose can be served by the proposed "religious poll" to be taken through the newspapers of the country by the International Advertising Association, acting for the Federal Council of Churches. The proposal, even though made with the best of intentions, bears too much the appearance of a publicity stunt; it smacks not so much of the church as of the press-agent. According to its sponsors, the poll is designed to show the extent of religious sentiment in the nation, and thus furnish a basis for a vast advertising campaign to be undertaken later. But its benefits under this heading are at best doubtful, and its flaws are of such a nature as to make the plan seem highly ill-advised.

Newspaper straw-ballots—and essentially that is what the present scheme resolves itself into—have been notoriously futile and inaccurate. They cannot be said to measure, or even reflect, the true sentiment of the communities in which they are taken. Because of their very futility, the number of intelligent persons who participate is relatively small.

But there are many surprisingly active minority groups to whom the straw-ballot furnishes a grand opportunity. Through it they attempt to show a tremendous sentiment in favor of their own particular line. While the great majority of citizens remain passively positive in their opinions, aroused to action only by some great moral issue, these busy minorities welcome every straw-ballot with enthusiasm. It is to them that the present stunt will appeal most heartily, and not to the thinking people of the nation, whose opinions are of greatest value. Such a straw-ballot as that intended, instead of determining the status of religion in America, will serve largely as a medium for little bands of atheists and non-believers to magnify their own theories into matters of vast importance.

If the sole aim of the "religious poll" were to stimulate discussion on religious matters, it might be justified. But rather than that, the intention is "to find out how many persons in this country believe in God." And the results are to be utilized as material for a general campaign of publicity and propaganda.

The combination of religion and modern advertising is one that must be effected skilfully if at all. Religion is personal, individualistic. Its spirit comes from within. It cannot be "sold" to people, as cans of beans or special brands of cigarets are sold.

The "Angelic Friar."—Fr. George Cobb writing in the *Universe* says:

The enthusiastic admiration of non-Catholics for Angelico, the Dominican monk, is second only to their admiration for St. Francis of Assisi, the founder of that other great mendicant Order.

Take, for example, this eulogy of Sir Martin Conway: "Nothing more perfect of its kind was ever painted than the Dance of the Blessed with the Angels. . . Fra Angelico's angels were the very incarnation of celestial spirits as pictured by mediæval fancy. No wonder people called him the angelic friar. He seemed to his contemporaries to belong himself to the angelic fellowship, and, in painting angels, to paint his equals and his friends."

This is a happy commentary upon the name given to Friar John of Fiesole by those of his time—Beato Angelico. More than that, we hear the popular voice of his day hailing him as Blessed.

In the valley of Mugello, N.W. of Florence, not far from the birthplace of Giotto and the Medici family, was born Guy, son of Peter, at the village of Vicchio in 1397. In early youth he came to Florence to learn the art of painting, a lucrative employment in those days.

He was a painter turned monk, and not, as many have supposed, a monk turned painter through the art of illuminating manuscripts. This mistake arose from the confusion of identity between this artist and his brother, Friar Benedict, who did illuminate most beautifully. It was the days of the great Dominican Reform, when Blessed John Dominic, with his fiery eloquence was eagerly seeking a return of the Order to the austerities of St. Dominic's day. Guy and his brother were drawn to the religious life, as also the illustrious St. Antoninus, by his eloquence.

In 1407 the two brothers joined the reformed monastery at Fiesole. His year's novitiate was spent at Cortona. Then, owing to the troubles of the anti-Pope, all monks at Fiesole were forced to take flight to Foligno in Umbria, where they stayed five years.

Friar John, whilst pursuing his studies for the priesthood, came in contact with that mysticism of Umbria—the land of St. Francis—which powerfully influenced his artistic mind. He was, above all things an eager disciple of that great mystic St. Catherine of Siena, who had striven so hard for the reform of the Dominicans. Cardinal Capecelatro remarks: "One and the other, overcome with the love of God, sought with all their power to express divine beauty, the one by word the other with the brush."

In 1412 the exiles moved to Cortona, and during the four years spent there Friar John was ordained and could at last break silence, and preach to the world by the one great means in his power, that of painting. It is Dante who calls painting "parlar visible," "visible speech." In Sienese Art in Cortona, as in Umbrian Art around Foligno, he found his greatest inspirations.

In 1416 the fugitives returned to their beloved home in Fiesole, and he began his life as a priest-artist. Amongst the painters of his day be was the best and most sincere observer of nature. To him, as to the psalmist and St. Francis, every creature has a tongue to praise its Creator. Within an artist's eye he observed his brethren, his beloved mendicants, the men he came in contact with, the saintly women praying in the church, and crowded all these into his frescoes.

From 1415 to 1445 he lived in or around Florence at a time when the city of the Arno was "a universal smile." Cosimo de Medici, with his simplicity, popularity and liberality which lacked ambition, was its first and foremost citizen. It was the epoch when Florence, papal, Catholic, joyous and peaceful, harboured the fugitive Pope Eugenius IV who consecrated San Marco, the new home of the reformed Dominicans in Florence.

This monastery built at the expense of Cosimo, by his architect Michelozzo, whose walls are covered with Angelico's heavenly visions, the home of Antoninus, Angelico, Benedict, and later, Savonorola, is indeed famous in a city where art

treasures abound. Its library, owing to Cosimo's munificence, became one of the most famous in Europe. Even today one enters San Marco and is lifted into another world on reading Angelico's poem of faith and penitence written on the walls.

In 1445 he went to Rome at the invitation of Eugene IV to paint in the Vatican. He stayed as a guest at the Dominican Monastery of the Minerva. It was he who successfully suggested the name of Antoninus to the Pope to fill the vacant See of Florence. When the Pope died in 1447, his successor, Nicholas V, appointed the artist to paint the frescoes on the walls of the new chapel, now called the Chapel of Nicholas V. Here is still to be seen the mature genius of Angleico. In the "Consecration of St. Lawrence" it is noteworthy that the consecrating Pope, is a portait of Nicholas V. In the "Distribution of Alms" we see a subject dear to the soul of the artist, who passionately loved the poor.

After the Jubilee of 1450 a plague broke out in Rome, and in 1451 Friar John was appointed prior of the Fiesole monastery. Towards the end of 1453 he returned to the Eternal City, and at the age of 66 died at the monastery of the Minerva in 1455. He is buried in the Minerva, close to his own beloved St. Catharine, who lies beneath the High Altar. His is an upright tomb, simple as the monk himself. His carved effigy shows him with hands crossed and eyes lowered, around the mouth the dawn of a smile, to betoken that joyousness which was the life-long companion of this innocent soul.

What New York Catholics Owe to Mexico.—*America* recently carried two pertinent contributions regarding the substantial aid rendered by Mexico to New York Catholics. In the issue of January 15, Mr. Alfred W. McCann says:

Whether or not the United States owes a debt to Mexico may be a matter of debate, but certainly the Catholics of New York owe a debt which has not been paid.

St. Peter's was the first Catholic church of New York. Reverend William O'Brien, a Dominican, who was well recommended by Archbishop Troy of Dublin, according to Bishop Carrol in a letter to Father Plowden, dated November 7, 1787, was appointed the pastor of St. Peter's succeeding the deposed Father Nugent. The Catholics of New York at that period were few in number and poor. They could neither afford to finish the church, nor to decorate it. Unable to find the necessary funds, Father O'Brien, soon after his appointment, journeyed to Mexico to collect money for building purposes. The Archbishop of Mexico, Don Alonzo Nuñez de Haro, received him kindly and gave him permission to collect what he could.

The minutes of the Board of Trustees of St. Peter's Church record the fact that Father O'Brien collected $4,920 in Mexico and returned to New York with some valuable paintings for the decoration of the church. In those days $4,920 was a large sum of money, yet the Catholics of Mexico were able to find that large sum for the poverty-stricken Catholics of New York. Four thousand nine hundred and twenty dollars seems a very large sum indeed when viewed in the light of New York Catholics begging from Mexican Catholics.

That in the year 1800, St. Peter's was able to establish the first free school —a Catholic school, a public school—on the island of Manhattan may be traced back to the generosity of Mexicans. The Government at Albany came to realize that St. Peter's free school was rendering priceless service to the state, and made a grant of money to its support long before there was any thought of establishing a public-school system of any kind. Obviously the generosity of Mexican Catholics is bound up with the education of New York.

This is supplemented by T.F.M., who writes in the issue of January 22:

The reference made in *America* for January 15 by Alfred W. McCann to the help given by Catholic Mexico to the founders of St. Peter's, New York's pioneer congregation, recalls another instance of similar generosity. In January, 1848, the church and embryo college of the Holy Name opened by the Jesuit Fathers in Elizabeth Street, New York, was destroyed by fire just as this new foundation had begun its operations. It was not rebuilt, a location further uptown, the present site of St. Francis Xavier's in West Sixteenth Street, having been selected. This imposed a heavy debt on the Community, and the Rev. Hyppolite de Luynes and the Rev. Charles Maldonado were sent to Mexico by their superiors in 1851 to beg assistance. They were most hospitably received, especially by the Bishop of Guadalajara, who made them his personal guests. They collected $15,000 and also brought back a number of valuable paintings which are still ornamenting the walls of St. Francis Xavier's and of Fordham University.

Father de Luynes was one of the noted figures of the early days of St. Francis Xavier's. He was born in Paris in 1805 and was the son of Edward J. Lewins, the agent of the United Irishmen who went to France from Ireland to try and enlist the aid and active support of Napoleon in the Irish rebellion of 1798. When that failed, Lewins remained in France and successfully engaged in the silk industry. A *de* was added to his name, which in the course of years assumed the form of de Luynes. Father de Luynes was one of the Jesuits who came to New York from Kentucky in 1846 at the invitation of Bishop Hughes to take charge of St. John's College, Fordham. He died at St. Francis Xavier's January 2, 1876, generally regretted, for he was a man of charming personality and great mental ability.

Bishop Timon of Buffalo, in 1848, was another visitor to Mexico and the recipient of the generous charity of the Catholics there for the needs of his new diocese.

Now is the time to remember all this, as Mr. McCann suggests, and to reciprocate practically and promptly.

The Garibaldi Myth.—Mr. Maurice Wilkinson, M. A., F. R. Hist. S. of St John's College, Oxford, addressing the Lingard Society at its January meeting at 22 Russell Square, London, read an important paper. We are indebted to the *Universe* for the following summary.

> Mr. Wilkinson entitled his paper "The Myth of Garibaldi," by which he said, he meant the claims made in regard to that famous man's exploits in the year 1860. His earlier exploits were some of them romantic and

some of them, like his career in Rome in 1848, criminal, and in either case devoid of importance. The year 1860, however, from the time of the sailing from Quarto to the very qualified victory of the Volturno, is the period, and a short one—five months—in which the claims put forward for him to be a great general and a great statesman must be tested. After the Volturno, he admittedly did nothing more of importance.

Mr. Trevelyan's three books on Garibaldi form a fascinating epic in which, and especially in the last two, we have the myth in what will be its definite form.

For the facts of the campaign the account is excellent, but everything is subordinated to the hero, and Mr. Trevelyan refuses to see anything blameworthy in many of Garibaldi's very dubious acts. He is a doctrinaire Liberal. The Bourbon and Papal Governments were necessarily in the wrong, and the cause of the "red shirts" was always in the right. This is a very arguable point, and he would be a bold man who would say that the Italy of the Unification is a proof. That Garibaldi was brave, and that he was faithful to his humanitarian and pantheistic beliefs is certain. We may go further and say that he was very superior to his crowd of adventurers, who in the main represented the most marked anti-clerical, which is only a euphemism for atheistic, spirit of his day. The essential similarity of his views to those of Mazzini is made clear on many occasions, but he had more perception of realities than that dangerous visionary.

Garibaldi's success was made possible by an extraordinary chain of circumstances, which worked for him no less in Europe at large than in the particular kingdom which he so criminally attacked. In itself, to invade a kingdom protected by tens of thousands of well-armed troops and a not negligible fleet with about 1,200 irregulars was an act so suicidal that no soldier could ever have dreamed of it. He was a true fanatic, who thought nothing of the power of Francis II., Napoleon, and Francis Joseph so long as he had behind him his red shirts and a mob of Neapolitan loafers. The Bourbons had nearly a month in which to be saved, but an accountable delay occurred, and it was not until October 1 that the army poured out of Capua to the attack. By this time Victor Emmanuel had fought and won the battle of Castelfidardo. That victory was the really significant event, not what took place on the Volturno.

Garibaldi's rule in Naples, as in Sicily, had speedily disgusted the people, and scores of criminals were let loose as the liberal "victims of tyranny." The speedy return of Francis or the arrival of Victor Emmanuel alone could avert complete anarchy. The question arises, were the red shirts welcome or not? To some extent, yes. Sicily was under a virtually alien rule, and up to a certain point the folk welcomed an alien invader. They never gave any solid support to the Dictator, whose régime soon proved more foreign and much more exacting than the Bourbon. In Calabria, too, the 1,000 were not unwelcome, and the vacant and flighty

population of Naples gave Garibaldi a good reception, as they would have welcomed any free show; but the northern part of the kingdom remained loyal to its sovereign. It would be true to say that in the enthuiasm of the moment, however much they may have subsequently regretted it, the mass of the people did welcome Victor Emmanuel, were thankful to be rid of Garibaldi, and were indifferent to the fate of Francis.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here does not preclude extended notice in later issues of the REVIEW.)

BERNARD, HENRY, S. J., *Essai Historique sue les Exercices Spirituels de Saint Ignace.* Louvain: Editions du Museum Lessianum, 1926. Pp. vii + 264.

BOOK, WILLIAM F., *Learning how to Study and Work Effectively.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1926. Pp. xviii + 475.

CALLCOTT, WILFRED HARDY, Ph.D., *Church and State in Mexico,* 1822-1857. Durham: Duke University Press, 1926. Pp. 357.

CHRISTOPHER, JOSEPH PATRICK, Ph.D., *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi de Catechizandis Rudibus Liber Unus.* Washington: The Catholic Education Press, 1926. Pp. xxi + 365.

COOK, ALBERT S. and C. B. TINKER, *Translations from Old English Poetry.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1926. Pp. viii + 195.

CREUSEN, J., S. J. and F. VAN EYEN, *Tabulae Fontium Traditionis.* Louvain: Editions du Museum Lessianum, 1926.

CRUMP, G. G. and E. F. JACOB (editors), *The Legacy of the Middle Ages.* New York: Oxford University Press American Branch, 1926. Pp. xi + 549.

DEALY, JAMES QUAYLE, *Foreign Policies of the United States.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1926. Pp. viii + 402.

DE LA BLANCHE. P. VIDAL (edited by Emmanuel De Martonne, translated from the French by Millicent Todd Bingham, Ph.D.), *Principles of Human Geography.* New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1926. Pp. xv + 511.

DE WULF, MAURICE, *History of Mediaeval Philosophy.* New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1926. Pp. xii + 336.

D'HERBIGNY, MGR, *Pâques* 1926 *en Russie du Jeudi-Saint (1er Avril) au Surlendemain de l' Ascension* (15 *Mai*). Paris: Editions Spes, 1926. Pp. 141.

ELLIOTT, REV WALTER, C. S. P., *Mission Sermons.* Washington: The Apostolic Mission House, 1926. Pp. xii + 243.

ELNETT, ELAINE, Ph.D., *Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia.* New York: Columbia University Press. 1926. Pp. xi + 151.

ERSKINE, MARJORIE, *Mother Philippine Duchesne.* New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1926. Pp. xiii + 400.

FENN, PERCY THOMAS, Jr., *The Origin of the Right of Fishery in Territorial Waters.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. 245.

FILLION, L.Cl., S. S. (Translated by J. C. Reville, S. J.), *The Study of the Bible.* New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1926. Pp. vi + 310.

FOLWELL, WILLIAM WATTS, *A History of Minnesota* (Vol. III). St. Paul: The Minnesota Historical Society, 1926. Pp. xiii + 605.

FRANCKE, KUNO, *German After-War Problems.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. 134.

FRENCH ALLEN (editor), *A British Fusilier in Revolutionary Boston,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. xi + 83.

GIDDINGS, T. P. and others, *Music Appreciation in the Schoolroom.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1926. Pp. vi + 557.

GOYENS, P. JEROME, O. F. M., *Le P. Louis Hennepin, O. F. M., Missionnaire au Canada au XVIIe Siècle.* Montreal: Librairie Saint François, 1926. Pp. 66.

HAFEN, LEROY R., Ph.D., *The Overland Mail* 1849-1869, *Promoter of Settlement, Precursor of Railroads.* Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1926. Pp. 361.

HUGOLIN, R. P., O. F. M., *Le Père Joseph Denis, Premier Récollet Canadien (1657-1736)* (2 Vols.) Montreal: Librairie Saint François, 1926. Pp. Vol. I, 204; Vol. II, 207.

MANLY, JOHN MATTHEWS, *English Prose and Poetry.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1926. Pp. xxxviii + 882.

POWERS, REV. GEORGE C., A. F. M., M. A., *The Maryknoll Movement.* Maryknoll: The Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, 1926. Pp. xix + 167.

SHAW, KINN WEI, Ph.D., *Democracy and Finance in China: A Study in the Development of Fiscal Systems and Ideals.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. Pp. 215.

SCOTT, MARTIN J., S. J., *Religion and Common Sense.* New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1926. Pp. 320.

SHORT, ADAM, *Documents Relatifs à La Monnaie au Change et aux Finances du Canada sous le Régime Français.* Ottawa: F. A. Acland (King's Printer), 1925. Pp. Vol. I, xci + 557; Vol. II, 595.

SMITH, SHERMAN M., Ph. D., *The Relation of the State to Religious Education in Massachusetts.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Book Store, 1926. Pp. vii + 350.

THORNDIKE, LYNN, Ph. D., *A Short History of Civilization.* New York: F. S. Crofts & Company, 1926. Pp. xiv + 619.

VAN DEN OUDENRIJN, MARCUS ANTONIUS, *Nebhu'ah: De Prophetiae Charismate in Populo Israelitico Libri Quattuor.* Rome: Typographia Befani, 1926. Pp. xxiv + 410.

WERTENBAKER, THOMAS JEFFERSON, *The American People. A History.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926. Pp. x + 486.

ZOVELL, FRANCISCUS, S. J., *Chronica Ecclesiae Arbelensis.* Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1926. Pp. 204.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Annual Meeting Held in Worcester, October 21, 1925. Worcester: The Society, 1926. Pp. 298 + xxvii.